

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय
SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY
954.509
M37
V 2.

RISE AND GROWTH OF INDIAN NATIONALISM.

Non-violent Nationalism: Gandhi and His School.

BY

M. A. BUCH, M. A., Ph. D.

Professor of Philosophy, Baroda College.

1939

BARODA : INDIA

Price Rs. 10

First Edition.

Printed by P. A. Chitre, B. A., at the
Atmaram Printing Press, Baroda, India.

PREFACE.

There has come out of late years a flood of literature about Mahatma Gandhi and his movement. It is as it should be. There is no doubt that M. Gandhi is a challenge both to the old and the new order in India, and therefore it is up to us to understand him properly before we move on and take the next step forward. I consider Gandhism as a great attempt on the part of genuine Hinduism to assert itself once more in the new conditions of to-day and to re-conquer India and through her the rest of the world by the power of her ideas.

I intend here in the first place to analyse the whole thought of Gandhiji and interpret it in the light of its fundamental ideas. My aim is an objective presentation of Gandhism in the light of its historical context and as a part of the evolution of the modern Indian thought. This volume should be read with other volumes in the series.

I regret that I was not able to see a recent book on Mahatma Gandhi edited by Sir S. Radhakrishnan.

Gandhi Jayanti,
2nd October 1939.

M. A. BUCH.

CONTENTS.

RISE AND GROWTH OF INDIAN NATIONALISM

Non-violent Nationalism : Gandhi and His School

1. THE PLACE OF GANDHI IN INDIAN POLITICS.

GANDHI'S advent into Indian politics marks an epoch in modern Indian history. For the last twenty five years, his has been a dominating figure in Indian public life. No one has exercised so much influence over Indian mind during the last hundred and fifty years, since the conquest of India by Great Britain. His leadership has been unique in more than one way : he is truly one of the great Makers of Modern India. He is not taken as a religious leader: but his contributions to the religious reconstruction of Hinduism entitle him to a prominent place among the great religious prophets and saints of India. He does not appear to people as a great social reformer like Mahadeo Govinda Ranade: but his claims to a reconstruction of Hindu society are second to none. He is not a great literary figure : and yet his writings and speeches have made a permanent mark upon the literature of Gujarat. Gandhi is a saint among politicians and a politician among saints. In him the highest religious idealism is combined with a strong practical sense, a genuine passion for social service, an undying devotion to his motherland, and above all, the will to translate that religious idealism into concrete deeds of daily life. It is this blending of romance and reality,

this yearning to soar into the sky while keeping his feet firmly planted on the solid earth, that is the secret of the matchless leadership of Gandhi.

Gandhi is essentially a man of action. He has never been a mere visionary, a dreamer of dreams. He is made of sterner stuff. His life itself is an epic: but he has no place in his life for mere sentimental type of poetry, for the idle songs of an empty day. He has always lived with a purpose: he has never drifted. There is a strong vein of religious mysticism in his nature, which often makes his conduct a little inexplicable to people. His dependence on God, his invocation of His voice in hours of genuine mental difficulty, his gropings for the light within, often puzzle those who are trying to understand him. But he never loses touch with reality: he never loses his confidence in himself or his God: he never for a moment forsakes the cause which is dearest to him. Poetry or art or literature or even religion provides for him an escape from the worry of his usual life, a retreat from his everyday problems. He never ceases to live for his country, because it is almost literally true of him that if he ceases to work for his country, he ceases to live altogether. His country is the centre of his consciousness, of his life: and he expresses his devotion to her in the only way possible to him, by a completest dedication of his self, in thought, word, and deed, to her.

But his worship of his country does not blind him for a moment to the vaster humanity around him. His worship of his country is really his worship of his God, his worship of humanity. The God-intoxicated Gandhi finds his God in humanity; and the humanity which has direct claims on him, which stands most in need of service at his hands, which can effectively appreciate and make use of his personality has been the Indian humanity, the men, women, and children of India. The worship of India

therefore, to him essentially means the worship of humanity, of God. His patrotism, therefore, never degenerates into a fanatic devotion to his "own country, right or wrong." His nationalism is rooted in humanitarianism and his love for justice and freedom for all. It is not so much his passion for political freedom or his passion for democracy that has driven him to politics: it is his determination to bring the realization of God within the reach of the poorest that has turned him into a politician.

Gandhi is essentially a man of the people. He has not been a weaver and a farmer as a matter of pose: he is actually trying to live the life of a weaver and a farmer, in order to be able to look at all questions from the point of view of the weaver and the farmer. India to him generally means village India, the India of the agriculturist. The rest of India merely leads a parasitical existence, more or less; but the poor, oppressed, hard-working peasant of the Indian villages is the real incarnation of the India of Gandhi's imagination. What is the use of Shakespeare and Kalidas to the man whose whole life is one long effort for barest living, under the hardest conditions? What is the use of the increasing wealth of India as judged from various points of view by the Government, if the oppressed peasantry sees no relief, no light in it? Gandhi has tried to merge his being in the being of the toiling millions of India, who are not mere figures of statistics to him, but the actual realities which alone ought to count in the Indian scene. The economic system which does not bring message of hope for them has no meaning for him; the educational system which does not make their intellectual horizon brighter is only a costly and wicked farce; the constitutional frame-work which ignores them or makes mere use of them is only a wicked design of the politician. The one test which Gandhi applies to every scheme is its moral and material adequacy from the point

of view of the millions who merely work and sweat, in order that others may prosper.

But Gandhi's advocacy of the poor and the ignorant masses of India is only an outcome of his profound religious nature, just as his patriotism is a mere offshoot of his passion for God. Here is the centre of Gandhi's personality, the master light of all his seeing. It is, therefore, that he does not turn a communist. He wants the millions of India to have the minimum of subsistence, because otherwise they cannot fully live the life of the God that is within them. He has, therefore, no quarrel with the princes of India or the English governing officers provided they do not obstruct his ambitions for the masses. He has infinite trust in God, and in human nature which does contain, according to him, the spirit of Divinity in a latent or manifest form; and he builds all his schemes of social and political amelioration upon it. No mechanical scheme, no social system as such possesses the secret of the salvation of India or of humanity. It is the spirit of man which alone matters : and Gandhi takes his stand upon this spirit of the infinite in the finite man for the realization of all his aspirations. Institutions are the mere media of the expression of our innermost selves : and if the innermost self insists upon truth and justice, the institutions are bound to modify themselves accordingly. Hence there is no Gandhi cult for him, no set of dogmas which he wants to fasten on his people. Hence there is no Gandhi organisation for him, no followers of Gandhi, no church, and no ritual. Gandhism, like Hinduism, is a spirit, not a dogma; it is an attitude, not a creed; it is a process of thinking and living and not a hidebound organisation. Gandhi himself is an erring follower of Gandhism, a devoted worshipper of the eternally valid, and yet eternally elusive ideals of the love of God and love of truth. Gandhism is not, therefore, a formula : it is the agelong passion for

God directing Gandhi, in ways peculiar to him, to realise Him in his service of humanity and of India.

Gandhi, however, has been for the last twenty years a political leader of India of the very first order. As a political leader, he has a definite place in the history of recent national evolution of India. He continues the tradition of revival of ancient culture which began with Swami Dayananda. His breadth of mind and freedom from bigotry definitely link him with Swami Vivekananda. He inherits the Tilak tradition of politics, and bases his movements always on the mass mind. In his passion for God and his attempt to derive patriotic inspiration from Him,he reminds us of Arobindo Ghosh. He, therefore, really belongs to the great national renaissance movement of Hinduism. But these currents become wedded in him with other equally broad and rich currents. There is the Gokhale tradition of moderation and sobriety in him, and the consequent attempt on his part to carry his opponents always with him, as far as possible, by methods of sweet persuasion. In him, therefore, we find a confluence of the divergent tendencies of Indian thought, the tendency to nationalise the Indian mind, and the tendency to broaden and liberalise it. But in spite of his frequent reference to Gokhale as his political Guru, he really carries forward the revivalist and militant tradition of the Dayananda and Tilak school.

But what is most characteristic of Gandhi is that a deeper religious vein of idealism, which he owes to the inspiration of Hinduism as well as Christianity, transforms his politics radically and gives it a terrible force which it would never otherwise possess. In him the passion of Hindu for Truth, for ancient Upanishadic Truth and for typical Hindu ways of thinking, mingles with the passion of the western prophets like Tolstoy and Ruskin for a purer and simpler life : and when this curious relig-

ious and revivalist fervour bursts out in the world of action in India, it necessarily explodes like a dynamite. Political freedom so dear to Tilak and economic freedom so dear to Gokhale take in him a wider form and become a demand for a return to medieval or ancient simplicity and spirituality of life for the masses. The forces of political and economic nationalism combine with the forces of cultural and religious nationalism and assume a peculiarly revolutionary form.

A distinguished Liberal thus testifies to Gandhi's greatness in Indian politics. " Compared to the influence which he wields over men, that of the politicians who have gone before him is only the influence of the leader of a political clique or of the manager of a party organisation. While the political fighters and leaders whom Mr. Gandhi has made out of date and unfashionable for a time, if not for ever, in their political addresses and agitations, appealed only to thousands gathered in annual or provincial conferences, Mr. Gandhi has touched to the quick the imagination and fired the enthusiasm of the millions of rural India. The Gokhales, the Mehtas, and the Bannerjeas of a decade ago who moved the political gatherings of their times in eloquent English speeches, to constitutional and respectful protests against the policy of Government, seem to belong to a generation that has passed away. Political discussion, which till he took it up, was the monopoly of the classes, has now, thanks to him, become the property of the masses. The monster meetings that he has addressed up and down the country during the past three years, the successful *hartals* * that he has brought about, the *khaddar*‡ campaign that is now in progress, throw into the shade all the political demonstrations of the past. The masses were politically dead and now they are quick : that is the work of Mr. Gandhi.

* Strikes ‡ Hand-spun cloth.

"Mr. Gandhi has knocked out of popular esteem not only Moderate opportunists, but Nationalist Extremists. He has made unfashionable not only Mr. Gokhale, but Mr. Krishnavarma. The revolutionary movement of a decade ago was an urban movement. It was a *Bhadralog* or bourgeois movement. It never reached the rural millions of the country. It left them cold or passive. But Mr. Gandhi's movement has gripped the loyalty of rural India which is the India that matters at present and for some time to come. For the thousands who were caught in the revolutionary and anarchist conspiracies of the pre-Gandhi time, millions now follow and swear by Mr. Gandhi's creed and methods. While the revolutionary movement was a class conspiracy, compared to it, Mr. Gandhi's is a national movement."[1]

2. *GANDHI IN SOUTH AFRICA.*

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born at Porbander on October 2nd, 1869. He comes from the peninsula of Kathiawad, which is a part of Gujarat. Kathiawad, however, resembles the Deccan more than Gujarat; because the soil is hard, the country is poor, and the people are hardy. Gandhi is a *Bania* or *Vaishya* that is to say a member of a caste which on the whole identifies with industry and commerce. But the Gandhi family for two generations was a Diwan family, a family which gave administrators to the States of Porbunder and Rajkot. Gandhi's father had the reputation of being very loyal to the State he served, and in general very impartial and incorruptible. Gandhi's mother was very religious and almost saintly. His fondness for fasts and daily prayers, he has almost inherited from his mother. Gandhi's parents were *Vaishnavas* that is, they practised the cult of *Bhakti* or devotion.

Gandhi was always a shy boy and was married very early when he was at school. The one habit which he cultivated from the beginning was the habit of truthfulness. Gandhi found it at first difficult and then impossible to lie. "But one thing took deep root in me : the conviction that morality is the basis of things, and that truth is the substance of all morality."[1]

Gandhi went to England in 1888, where he stuck to his vegetarianism. During his stay in England, he was so different from other Indian students in his ways. He successfully avoided the temptations of life in Europe for a young man. He was introduced to the Bible by a friend: but it did not make much impression on him then. But the Gita struck him as a priceless book. To-day Gandhi considers it as the "supreme book for the knowledge of Truth."

In 1891, he returned to India, after having passed his law examinations. He bagan his practice as a barrister at Rajkot, but soon shifted to Bombay. There he came in contact with Raychandbhai who became Gandhi's religious help and guide for some time. "Three moderns have left a deep impression on my life and captivated me: Raychandbhai by his living contact, Tolstoy by his book 'The Kingdom of God is within you', and Ruskin by his 'Unto This Last.'"

In 1893, Gandhi went to South Africa to advise on an important case. This visit to Africa was really a Providential visit, for it marked a turning point not only in his life, but eventually also in the life of the Indian community. The insulting treatment that he received there opened his eyes to the position of Indians in the Empire. An Indian there was called a "coolie" and Gandhi was called a "coolie barrister." He was pushed out from the first-class compartment, although he had a first-class ticket. He was refused admission

in a hotel. He was kicked out from a foot-path. He suffered violence at the hands of a mob. All these incidents were mere symptoms of a deep disease-colour and race prejudice.

Here was a call to service. Circumstances forced the fight on Gandhi. He started an agitation against discriminating legislation against Indians. The Natal Indian Congress was founded in 1894 to watch Indian interests. Gandhi started a two-fold agitation-one for the reform of the Indians and the other for a redress of their grievances. In 1896, he went to India and made acquaintance with Indian political leaders.

In 1899, the Boer War broke out. Gandhi took this opportunity of showing the stuff of which Indian loyalty was made. His argument deserves to be quoted at length. He said, " Our existence in South Africa is only in our capacity as British subjects. In every memorial we have presented, we have asserted our rights as such. We have been proud of our British citizenship, or have given our rulers and the world to believe that we are so proud. Our rulers profess to safeguard our rights because we are British subjects, and what little rights we still retain, we retain because we are British subjects. It would be unbecoming to our dignity as a nation to look on with folded hands at a time when ruin stared the British in their face as well as ourselves, simply because they ill-treat us here. And such criminal action could only aggravate our difficulties. If we missed this opportunity, which has come to us unsought, of proving the falsity of a charge which we believe to be false, we should stand self-condemned, and it would be no matter for surprise, if then the English treated us worse than before and sneered at us more than ever. The fault in such a case would lie entirely at our door. To say that the charges preferred against ourselves had no foundation in fact and were absolutely untenable, would only be to deceive ourselves. It is true, we might argue, that we are helots

in the Empire, but so far we have tried to better our condition, continuing the while to remain in the Empire. That has been the policy of all our leaders in India and ours also. And if we desire to win our freedom and achieve our welfare as members of the British Empire, here is a golden opportunity for us to do so by helping the British in the War by all the means at our disposal. It must largely be conceded that justice is on the side of the Boers, but every single subject of a State must not hope to enforce his private opinion in all cases. The authorities may not always be right, but so long as the subjects owe allegiance to a State, it is their clear duty generally to accommodate themselves, and to accord their support, to acts of the State.

"Again, if any class among the subjects considers that the action of a Government is immoral from a religious standpoint, then, before they help or hinder it, they must endeavour fully and even at the risk of their lives to dissuade Government from pursuing such a course. We have done nothing of the kind. Such a moral crisis is not before us, and no one says that we wish to hold aloof from this war for any such universal and comprehensive reason. Our ordinary duty as subjects, therefore, is not to enter into the merits of the war but, when war has actually broken out, to render such assistance as we possibly can."[1]

Gandhi, however, was all along preparing himself and the Indians in South Africa to fight for their rights. The Asiatic Registration Act of 1906 was a call to them to act. They resolved to suffer imprisonment rather than yield. This was the birth of the Satyagraha movement. Now in a Satyagraha struggle, the fighters must be convinced of the perfect rightness of their cause and of the untenable position of the opponents. The case of the opponents, therefore, deserves fullest consideration at the

hands of the Satyagrahis. The case from the point of view of General Smuts may be thus put : " South Africa is a representative of Western civilisation, while India is the centre of Oriental culture. Thinkers of the present generation hold that these two civilisations cannot go together. If nations representing these rival cultures met even in small groups, the result would only be an explosion. The West is opposed to simplicity, while the Orientals consider that virtue is of prime importance. How can these opposite views be reconciled ? It is not the business of statesmen, practical men as they are, to adjudicate upon the rival merits of each. Western civilisation may or may not be good, but Westerners wish to stick to it. They have made tireless endeavours to save that civilisation. They have suffered great hardships in the cause of that civilisation. It was, therefore, too late for them now to chalk out a new path for themselves. Thus considerd, the Indian question cannot be resolved into one of trade jealousy or race hatred. The problem is one of preserving one's own civilisation, that is, of enjoying the supreme right of self-preservation, and discharging the corresponding duty. Some public speakers might like to inflame the Europeans by finding fault with Indians, but political thinkers believe and say that the very qualities of Indians count for defects in South Africa. The Indians are disliked in South Africa for the simplicity, patience, perseverance, frugality, and other-worldliness. Westerners are enterprising, engrossed in multiplying their material wants and in satisfying them, fond of good cheer, anxious to save physical labour, and prodigal in habits. They are, therefore, afraid that if thousands of Orientals settled in South Africa, the Westerners must go to the wall. Westerners in South Africa were not prepared to commit suicide and their leaders would not permit them to be reduced to such straits."[1]

But Gandhi considered this reasoning to be pure

sophistry, designed to conceal the real motive of self-interest and race-hatred. " Thousands of Europeans have admitted in their writings, that trade by Indians hits petty British traders hard, and the dislike of brown races has at present become part and parcel of the mentality of Europeans. The Negroes of the U. S. have accepted Western civilisation. They have embraced Christianity. But the black pigment of their skin constitutes their crime. "[1]

A Satyagrahi's case must be very strong. He has to weigh and balance both sides of the question and give full credit to the opponent for motives. He must seek every constructive channel of being useful and show his *bona fides*. He must not go into fight except as a last resort. The Asiatic Registration Act was designed to strike at the very root of the existence of the Indian community in South Africa. It was a question of life and death for the Indians. It was even more: it was a question which involved the honour of India too. An insult to one innocent Indian is an insult to the whole nation. Gandhi, therefore, for the first time invoked the weapon of under-going cool-blooded suffering for a righteous cause. In a speech full of gravity, he asked people to be serious with themselves and very deliberately take the great plunge. " I wish to explain to this meeting that there is a vast difference between this resolution and every other resolution we have passed up-to-date and that there is a wide divergence also in the manner of making it. It is a very grave resolution we are making, as our existence in South Africa depends upon our fully observing it. The manner of making the resolution suggested by our friend is as much of a novelty as of a solemnity....

"We all believe in one and the same God, the differences of nomenclature in Hinduism and Islam notwithstanding. To pledge ourselves or to take an oath in the

name of God or with Him as witness is not something to be trifled with. If having taken such an oath, we violate our pledge, we are guilty before God and man. Personally I hold that a man, who deliberately and intelligently takes a pledge and then breaks it forfeits his manhood. And just as a copper coin treated with mercury not only becomes valueless when found out but also makes its owner liable to punishment, in the same way a man who lightly pledges his word and then breaks it, becomes a man of straw and fits himself for punishment here as well as hereafter...

" I know that pledges and vows are, and should be, taken on rare occasions. A man who takes a vow every now and then is sure to stumble. But if I can imagine a crisis in the history of the Indian community of South Africa when it would be in the fitness of things to take pledges, that crisis is surely now. There is wisdom in taking serious steps with great caution and hesitation. But caution and hesitation have their limits which we have now passed. The Government have taken leave of all decency. We should only be betraying our unworthiness and cowardice, if we cannot stake our all in the face of the conflagration which envelops us. But every one must think out for himself, if he has the will and ability to pledge himself. Resolutions of this nature cannot be passed by a majority vote. Only those who take a pledge can be bound by it. This pledge must not be taken with a view to produce an effect on outsiders. Everyone must only search his own heart, and if the inner voice assures him that he has the requisite strength to carry him through, then only should he pledge himself and then only would his pledge bear fruit.

" A few words now as to the consequences ... If, on the one hand, one who takes a pledge must be a robust optimist, on the other hand, he must be prepared for the

worst ... We might have to go to jail where we might be insulted. We might have to go hungry and suffer extreme heat or cold. Hard labour might be imposed on us. We might be flogged by rude warders. We might be fined heavily and our property might be attached and held up to auction, if there are only a few resisters left. Opulent to-day, we might be reduced to abject poverty to-morrow. We might be deported. Suffering from starvation and similar hardships in jail, some of us might fall ill and die... If some one asks me when and how the struggle may end, I may say that if the entire community manfully stands the test, the end will be near. If many of us fall back under storm and stress, the struggle will be prolonged. But I can boldly declare and with certainty, that so long as there is a handful of men true to their pledge, there can only be one end to the struggle, and that is victory...

"Although we are going to take pledge in a body, no one should imagine that default on the part of one or many can absolve the rest from their obligation. Every one should fully realise his responsibility, then only pledge himself independently of others and understand that he himself must be true to his pledge even unto death, no matter what others do."[1]

Such was the birth of this great movement of Satyagraha. Gandhi only felt that some new principle had come into being. Here was the assertion of truth in a new form, not by the infliction of suffering on others,but by invitation of suffering from others. A new psychology is thus created where there is resistance to evil without invocation of force in any form, without harbouring hatred in any form. There is only the desire to demonstrate one's faith in the righteousness of one's cause, by inviting unlimited suffering in one's own person. There is consciousness not of weakness but of strength, born of a perfect faith in one's cause, in one's capacity

to live and suffer and die for the cause, and above all, in the higher possibilities of human nature and in God. There is no place for cunning or secrecy or diplomacy in the movement. There is only a determination to do the fullest justice to the opponent's point of view. The purer the sacrifice the nearer the victory. The more unselfish our devotion to our cause, the greater our chances for success. "There is no zest in killing one who welcomes death, and therefore, soldiers are keen upon seizing the enemy alive. If the mouse did not flee before the cat, the cat would be driven to seek another prey. If all lambs voluntarily lay with the lion, the lion would be compelled to give up feasting upon lambs." [1]

Gandhi thus laid the foundations of his Indian leadership in South Africa. But his own ideals and methods took a definite and almost a final shape there. It was there that he accepted virtually the life of a political ascetic, who renounced everything in order to be able to dedicate his all to the service of his mother country. It was there that he understood the importance of the place of chastity and celibacy in both private and public life. It was there that he developed his whole philosophy of life (as we see it in ' Indian Home Rule ') which in large outlines, if not in details, has never changed. He realized in South Africa that the true foundations of a real public life are to be found in character and in religiosity. His prayers, meditations, fasts became constant factors in his life. His attitude of revolt against Western civilisation was the outcome of his experiences there. But above all, he started and developed his method of non-violent resistance there.

The idea of *Ahimsa* first took possession of his heart when he heard very early in life a Gujerati verse which meant :—" If a man gives you a drink of water and you give him a drink in return that is nothing. Real beauty consists in doing good against evil. " The Sermon

on the Mount with its doctrine of non-resistance touched him profoundly. "Resist not him that is evil but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also." "Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be sons of your Father which is in Heaven." These passages flooded his being with joy. The Gita deepened the impression. Tolstoy and Thoreau gave it its present form.

3. *GANDHI IN INDIA.*

Gandhi returned to India in 1914, and settled there. He had a fascination for Gokhale, whom he considered his political *Guru*,† and, therefore, thought of joining the Servants of India Society. But wisely enough, after Gokhale's death, he decided to start an institute of his own, called Satyagraha Ashram. The one thing needed in India was character. His Ashram was a place where real character based on deep religious ideals, could grow. The inmates of this Ashrama were, therefore, called upon to practise certain discipline.

The first vow required in the Ashrama was the vow of truth. It means the practice of truth not as a matter of policy, but at all costs. It means the power to say 'no' even when 'no' might be a little unpleasing to friends, in the interests of truth.

Ahimsa is the second requirement. The inmates of the Ashrama should not harbour any uncharitable thought against any one. Those who accept this principle of Love will have nothing to do with violence in any form, assassinations open or secret.

Celibacy is the third requirement of the Ashramite. Married or unmarried, a life of celibacy is necessary for national service or for religious fulfilment.

---

† Teacher.

Self-control in the matter of eating and drinking is the next requirement. Simple fare which is necessary to remove hunger should do: but the refinements in dishes only serve to enslave us to our palate.

The vow of non-thieving comes next. No one ought to take anything which is not wanted for immediate use. Hoarding is a sin. Our possessions therefore should be reduced to a minimum.

The vow of Swadeshi requires that we should be content with the articles which our neighbours produce and the services which they render. If we are not satisfied with them, we can improve them. If we cannot produce what we want, we must learn to do without it. This principle is called the sacred law of our being.

The vow of fearlessness is equally characteristic. A paralysing fear has come over educated India. Fear of God is the only legitimate fear : and fear of God is incompatible with any other fear. A God-fearing man will not be afraid of earthly consequences. If public life in India is to be purified, this craven attitude which makes us say one thing in private and another in public, should go.

Gandhi thus started the training of the Indian public in his novel philosophy and methods. Politics is not essentially vulgar, we have made it vulgar. It is possible, it is absolutely necessary to raise it to a very high level. " Politics are a part of our being; " but politics must be based on religion. It is only when politics becomes our religion and religion becomes our politics that we in India can solve all our problems.

Gandhi started in India as a constructive politician. It would come as a surprise to many that Gandhi on the whole believed in the ideal of loyalty to the Raj. His faith in the Empire continued almost upto 1919. South Africa

taught him many lessons : but it did not destroy his faith in the Empire. His loyalty was not instinctive or mechanical: it was based on the fact that the Empire was to some extent an institution after his own heart. He said in 1915 :

" As a passive resister...I discovered that the British Empire had certain ideals with which I have fallen in love, and one of these ideals is that every subject of the British Empire had the freest scope for his energies and honour and whatever he thinks is due to his conscience. I think that this is true of the British Empire as it is not true of any other Government. I feel, as you perhaps here know that it is possible for me to be governed least under the British Empire. Hence my loyalty to the British Empire. "[1]

During the Great War, Gandhi threw himself wholeheartedly into the recruiting campaign even in the teeth of people's indifference and opposition. In his letter to the Viceroy he wrote: "If I could make my countrymen retrace their steps, I could make them withdraw all the Congress Resolutions and not whisper 'Home Rule' or 'Responsible Government' during the pendency of the War. I would make India offer all her able-bodied sons as a sacrifice to the Empire at its critical moment and I know that India, by this very act, would become the most favoured partner in the Empire and racial distinctions would become a thing of the past."[2] Gandhi asked his countrymen to defend the Empire, because if the Empire perished, our cherished aspirations would perish with it also. By enlisting in the army, " we help the Empire, we qualify ourselves for Swarajya, we learn to defend India and to a certain extent regain our lost manhood. I admit it is because of my faith in the English nation that I can advise as I am doing. I believe that, though this nation has done India much harm, to retain connection with that nation is to our advantage. Their virtues seem to out-

weigh their vices."[1]

But Gandhi found it impossible to acquiesce in tyranny and wrong-doing. He wrote to the Viceroy: "I shall resist organised tyranny to the uttermost. Thus Champaran and Kaira affairs are my direct, definite and special contributions to the War. Ask me to suspend my activities in that direction and you ask me to suspend my life. In season and out of season, therefore, I shall discipline myself to express in my life this eternal law of suffering, and present it for acceptance to those who care, and if I take part in my other activity, the motive is to show the matchless superiority of that law."[2]

The call of service came from Champaran, a place in Bihar. Here the peasants had many grievances against the indigo planters. Gandhi went to investigate into their grievances. He was asked to quit the district, but he offered civil disobedience. The Government climbed down, a commission was appointed with Gandhi as a member and the " Planters' Raj " came to an end.

The next call came from Kaira district. There was a failure of harvest. The ryots claimed that a suspension of the revenue was due under the rules. Gandhi was convinced that the Government estimate of the crops was wrong. When the Government did not show any disposition to listen to petitions, Gandhi advised the farmers to offer Satyagraha, which was not intended to discredit the Government or an individual official but " to assert the right of the people to be effectively heard in matters concerning themselves. "[3]

Another opportunity of Satyagraha was offered by the Ahmedabad mill strike. He advised the strikers to take a vow not to accept less than what he thought fair.

In Champaran, Satyagraha was completely success-

ful, because there was perfect non-violence of the leaders in thought, word, and deed. In Kaira and Ahmedabad, outward non-violence was maintained : but it was superficial. These struggles therefore did not completely succeed. In Ahmedabad, Gandhi had to resort to a fast, to prevent the weavers from giving way. "I am fully convinced that no body of men can make themselves into a nation or perform great tasks unless their promises came to be regarded by the world like the Law of the Medes and the Persians, inflexible and unbreakable."[1]

But the main object in each case was to secure an awakening of the people and to initiate them in this novel method of fighting for their rights The Agriculturists began to realise that the officers were not the masters but the servants of the people. But what was more difficult was to combine civility with fearlessness.

4. THE ROWLATT ACT AND THE PUNJAB DISORDERS

(The Birth of Non-co-operation I.)

The moment for a movement of Satyagraha on a national scale came rather soon. In 1917, the Government of India appointed a committee, presided over by Justice Rowlatt, to investigate and report on the nature and extent of the revolutionary conspiracies in India. The Committee recommended drastic changes in the ordinary penal law, in order to invest the Government with exceptional powers. The Rowlatt Act was passed in March 1919, in spite of grave warnings from the Indian public. Gandhi's faith in the Government was rudely disturbed. He felt that time had come when people must act, in order to safeguard their fundamental rights. He asked his countrymen to take the following pledge. "Being conscientiously of opinion that the Bills known as the Indian

Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill No. 1 of 1919, are unjust, subversive of the principles of liberty and justice, and destructive of the elementary rights of individuals on which the safety of the community as a whole and the State itself is based, we solemnly affirm that in the event of those Bills becoming law, and until they are withdrawn we shall refuse civilly to obey these laws and such other laws as a committee, to be hereafter appointed, may think fit, and further affirm that in this struggle we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person, or property."[1]

It was decided to observe a general hartal (strike) on the 6th of April. The hartal was a great success. Delhi however observed March 30th as a day of fast and hartal. The Hindus and Mussalmans united like one man: and Swami Shraddhanand was invited to speak in the Jumma Masjid. The hartal procession was fired upon and a number of casualties occurred. Similar events happened at Lahore and Amritsar. On the 10th April, Gandhi was arrested on his way to Delhi and sent back to Bombay. Serious riots occurred in Ahmedabad. All this was not anticipated. Gandhi confessed that he had committed a Himalayan blunder. " Before being able to offer effective civil disobedience, we must acquire habits of discipline, self-control, and qualities of leadership and obedience. "[2] " A departure from truth, "he wrote, " by a hair's breadth or violence committed against anybody, whether Englishman or Indian, will surely damn the great cause the Satyagrahis are handling. "[3]

Gandhi was released immediately after he was taken back to Bombay: but the news of his arrest enraged people all over India. In the Punjab, however, the Government, fearing that a storm was brewing, deported two leaders Dr. Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal from Amritsar. An excited crowd tried to force a way to the house of the Deputy

Commissioner with a view to make representation for the release of leaders. This crowd was twice fired at and made to go back. It grew violent, set fire to some Bank buildings, killed some Europeans and assaulted two ladies. Some buildings were destroyed and communications were cut in various places.

Quiet was restored: but there was panic in the air. General Dyer arrived on the 11th and took charge of the town. A proclamation was issued prohibiting all gatherings. A public meeting however was to take place on the Jallianwala Bagh on the 13th April at 4-30 p. m. General Dyer did not try to prevent the meeting but went to the meeting with troops and armoured cars and without giving any warning, ordered the troops to fire. The fire was kept up for ten minutes and continued till the ammunition was exhausted. The people tried to disperse; but between three and four hundred were killed; and more than a thousand persons were wounded. General Dyer himself said: "It was no longer a question of merely dispersing the crowd, but one of producing a sufficient moral effect, from a military point of view, not only on those who were present but more especially throughout the Punjab."[1] Sir Michael O' Dwyer sent to him a telegram, immediately afterwards. "Your action correct. Lieutenant-Governor approves."[2]

There was an outbreak of violence at Gujaranwala, Kasur and some other places. This was due to the news of the arrest of Gandhi and the happenings at Amritsar. The Martial Law was declared and a veritable reign of terror continued during its administration for six weeks. The water and electric supply of Lahore was cut off for some time, floggings became a common feature, and people were made to crawl on their bellies in one street.

Sir Sivaswamy's description, based on the Hunter Committee Report cannot be accused of the slightest

exaggeration. "Let us turn our eyes to some of the facts disclosed in the evidence of the principal European witnesses. The wholesale slaughter of hundreds of unarmed men at Jallianwalla Bagh, without giving the crowd an opportunity to disperse, the indifference of General Dyer to the condition of the hundreds of people who were wounded in the firing, the firing of machine-guns into crowds who had dispersed and taken to their heels, the flogging of men in public, the order compelling thousands of students to walk sixteen miles a day for roll-calls, the arrest and detention of 500 students and professors, the compelling of school children of five to seven to attend on parade to salute the flag, the order imposing upon owners of property the responsibility for the safety of the martial law posters stuck on their properties, the flogging of a marriage party, the censorship of mails, the closure of the Badshahi mosque for six weeks, the arrest and detention of people without any substantial reasons, and especially of people who had rendered service to the State in connection with the war or otherwise, the flogging of some six of the biggest boys in the Islamiah school simply because they happened to be school boys and to be big boys, the construction of an open cage for the confinement of arrested persons, the invention of novel punishments, like the crawling order, the skipping order, and others unknown to any system of law, civil or military, the handcuffing and roping together of persons and keeping them in open trucks for 15 hours, the use of aeroplanes and Lewes guns, and the latest paraphernalia of scientific warfare against unarmed citizens, the taking of hostages and the confiscation and destruction of property for the purpose of securing the attendance of absentees, the handcuffing of Hindus and Mahommedans in pairs with the object of demonstrating the consequences of Hindu-Mahommedan unity, the cutting off the electric and water supplies from Indian houses, the removal of fans from Indian

houses, the comandeering of all vehicles owned by Indians and giving them to Europeans for use, the feverish disposal of cases with the object of forestalling the termination of martial law, are some of the many incidents in the administration of martial law, which created a reign of terror in the Punjab and have shocked the public."[1]

Gandhi was completely shocked. He deeply regretted the outbreak of violence and condemned it in the strongest language. He saw his mistake in launching Satyagraha, without fully preparing the people, but he felt that the root of the trouble was the attitude of the Government. The passing of the Rowlatt Act, in the teeth of popular opposition, the unwarranted interference with the movements of Gandhi and his arrest, the deportation of Dr. Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal, and the brutal handling of the whole situation in the Punjab clearly showed that the Government was in no mood to understand the wishes of the people.

At Amritsar Congress, Gandhi was still hoping that the Government would repent and revise its attitude. The Royal Proclamation and the declaration of political amnesty had come in time to relieve the situation. Gandhi asked the Congress to respond to the appeal which declared: " A new era is opening. Let us begin with a common determination among my people and my officers to work together for a common purpose."[2] He still remained an apostle of co-operation and asked the Congress to work the reforms constructively and regret and condemn the excesses of the people at various places. The Amritsar Congress remained a great triumph for Gandhi.

Gandhi however pressed for a change of attitude on the part of the Government. There was a demand for an impartial inquiry into the Punjab tragedy. The Govern-

ment of India first passed the Indemnity Act, for the protection of the officers involved in the affair and then appointed the Hunter Committee. The Report was published on the 28th May, 1920. The English members considered that the outbreak was a premeditated revolt; while the Indian members took the view that it was an accidental outburst. The latter therefore thought that the Martial Law was not necessary. The Government of India accepted the view that "the administration of martial law was marred in particular instances by misuse of power, by irresponsible acts; that General Dyer acted beyond what any reasonable man could have thought it to be necessary and that he did not act with such humanity as the case permitted."[1] The Secretary of State remarked that "General Dyer acted to the best of his lights and with a sincerity of purpose, but that he committed an error of judgment."[2]

These attempts on the part of Government did not sooth the lacerated heart of India. Gandhi's faith in the Empire was rudely shaken. He saw grave menace to Indian self-respect in any further co-operation with such an unrepentant Government. General Dyer was regarded as a hero by many Englishmen: and his action was condoned by the House of Lords. Here was a secret conspiracy to uphold official iniquity. The nation could not tolerate such a scandal if it was to preserve its self-respect and become a free partner in the Empire. Petitions had ceased to have any value: because the nation so far had no power to enforce its will. The nation must invoke this power, if it was to survive as a self-respecting nation. Obedience to and co-operation with Government are certainly the rule. But when there are intolerable wrongs which affect the vital being of a people, they have the right and the duty to resist. India does not care to oppose violence by violence: but India may refuse to be a party in this conspiracy. "If then, the acts of the Punjab

Government be an insufferable wrong, if the report of Lord Hunter's Committee and the two dispatches be a greater wrong by reason of their grievous condonation of these acts, it is clear that we must refuse to submit to this official violence. Appeal to the Parliament by all means, if necessary, but if the Parliament fails us, and if we are worthy to call ourselves a nation, we must refuse to uphold the Government by withdrawing co-operation from it."[1]

5. *THE KHILAFAT QUESTION*

(The Birth of Non-cooperation II.)

Gandhi's faith in the Empire received another blow from a different quarter. It was the cause of the Khilafat. The Indian Muslims found themselves on the horns of a dilemma, during the Great War. England and Turkey were enemies. As followers of Islam, they owed a certain allegiance to the Sultan of Turkey, who was the Defender of their faith : and as subjects of the British, they owed loyalty to the Empire. The Indian Mahommedans however fought for the British in the hope that their holy places would be kept under the Turkish control. The Muslim soldiers would not fight to deprive the Khalif of suzerainty over these places. During the war,Mr. LLoyd George, the Prime Minister of England had given a pledge in these words: " Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race."[2] The treaty of Severes disillusioned the Muslims of India. They were alarmed. They held Khilafat conferences, sent Khilafat deputations, and declared that "any reduction of the claim would not only be a violation of the deepest religious feelings of the Mahommedans, but also a flagrant violation of the solemn declarations and pledges made or given by respon-

sible statesmen, representing Allied or Associated Powers and given at a time when they were desirous of enlisting the support of Muslim people and soldiery and warning them against the consequence of wrong decision, particularly when not only the Mussulmans but also the entire Hindu population were joining them in demand. "[1]

Gandhi soon took the leadership of the Indian Muslims. He felt that a grave injustice had been done to the Mahommedans in India. Their religious susceptibilities had been deeply wounded. Here was an opportunity to the Hindus to stand by the side of their Muslim brethren and thus advance the cause of Hindu-Muslim unity. The test of true friendship is assistance in adversity. If the Indians want to be one nation, the interests of one community should be the interests of all. He therefore advised unconditional union with the Muslims in the interests of the Khilafat.

On the 30th of June, a joint Hindu-Muslim conference decided at Allahabad to resort to non-cooperation, after a month's notice to the Viceroy. Gandhi wrote an open letter to Lord Chelmsford in which he declared: " Events that have happened during the past month have confirmed me in the opinion that the Imperial Government have acted in the Khilafat matter in an unscrupulous, immoral, and unjust manner and have been moving from wrong to wrong in order to defend their immorality.

" Your Excellency's light-hearted treatment of official crime, your exoneration of Sir Michael O' Dwyer, Mr. Montagu's Dispatch, and above all the shameful ignorance of the Punjab events and the callous disregard of the feelings of Indians betrayed by the House of Lords, have filled me with the gravest misgivings regarding the future of the Empire, have estranged me completely from the present Government, and have disabled me from

rendering, as I have hitherto wholeheartedly rendered, my loyal co-operation.

"In my humble opinion, the ordinary method of agitating by way of petitions, deputations, and the like, is no remedy for moving to repentance a Government so hopelessly indifferent to the welfare of its charge as the Government of India has proved to be. In European countries condonation of such grievous wrongs as the Khilafat and the Punjab would have resulted in a bloody revolution by the people. They would have resisted, at all costs, national emasculation. Half of India is too weak to offer violent resistance and the other half is unwilling to do so. I have therefore ventured to suggest the remedy of non-co-operation, which enables those who wish, to dissociate themselves from Government, and which, if unattended by violence and undertaken in an ordered manner, must compel it to retrace its steps and undo the wrongs committed."[1]

6. *GANDHI AND THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS*

Gandhi was now not without powerful allies. His position so far in Indian politics was peculiar. He had tried to remain a non-party man. He respected Lokamanya Tilak but his ways were very different. He was virtually heading for all-India leadership ever since he came back to India. In 1916, we had a united Congress, in which the Moderates as well the Mahommedans took an active part and formulated for the first time a scheme of Self-Government. It was attended by Tilak and Khaparde, Dr. Rash Bihari Ghosh and Surrendranath Bannerjee, Mazar-ul-Haq and Jinnah, Mrs. Besant and Gandhi. In 1917, an agitation for Home Rule was started. The new idea spread like wild fire. Mrs. Besant presided over the Congress in that year. She was interned and subsequently released.

In 1917, the Moderate Party had no first-class leaders, who could make a bid for all-India leadership. Gokhale and Pheroze Shah Mehta had passed away. Dadabhai Naoroji died in 1917 and Sir William Wedderburn followed him in 1918. Tilak was released in 1915, and soon became an all-India leader. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report was published in 1918. A special Congress met at Bombay to consider the report: The Moderate leaders, Sir Surrendranath Bannerjee and Mr. Srinivasa Shastri absented themselves from this Congress, because they were on the whole won over to the Reforms. The Delhi Congress (1918) repeated the demand of the Indian people for Responsible Government on the lines of the Congress-League Scheme, and called the Reforms "disappointing and unsatisfactory." Mr. Shastri objected to these words.

The Moderates now started the All-India Liberal Federation, with the avowed object of working the New Reforms. This was the first conscious separation of the Moderates from the National Congress. It was not without considerable misgivings that men like Surrendrenath Bannerjee seceded from the body, which they had built up with so much perseverance and sacrifice. But the issue was grave: whether to accept reforms or to wreck them. Had they continued as a minority in the Congress, they would not have counted at all. If India were ever to attain self-government, it could be by stages; and the reforms constituted a very important stage. "The Congress, however great an organisation, was after all, a means to an end. That end was self-government. We decided to sacrifice the means for the end. That was the *raison d'etre* of the Moderate or Liberal party as a separate party in the public life of India."[1]

Lokamanya Tilak's attitude was slightly different. Mr. Montagu asked him what he would do, if the reforms did not come up to his expectations. He replied, "I would

accept what is given and fight for more." At the Amritsar Congress (1919) he accepted the compromise resolution of C. R. Das and Gandhi, embodying the policy ef conditional responsive co-operation. Later, he published the manifesto of his party, called the "Congress Democratic Party." He declared: "This party proposes to work the Montagu Reforms Act for all it is worth and for acclerating the grant of full responsible Government, and for this purpose, it will without hesitation offer co-operation or resort to constitutional opposition, whichever may be expedient and best calculated to give effect to the popular will."[1]

The dramatic shift of Gandhi from co-operation to non-cooperation changed the whole face of Indian politics. Mrs. Besant ceased to see eye to eye not only with Gandhi but also with the Nationalists led by Tilak. She soon became a back number. Tilak expressed his doubts about the success of the new movement, but promised to do nothing to hinder its progress. He was not also enthusiastic about the Khilafat agitation. He, however, passed away on the midnight of July 31st, 1920. The 1st of August was a great day in Indian history. It marked the inauguration of Gandhi movement in India. In the special session of Congress at Calcutta, Gandhi had the support especially of the Ali brothers and the Muslims. Pandit Motilal Nehru also stood by his side. The opposition was led by C. R. Das, Pandit Malaviya and Mrs. Besant. But Gandhi easily carried the day and the policy of progressive, non-violent, non-cooperation was launched. At Nagpur, the resolution was ratified again, with the support this time of C. R. Das. The goal of the Congress was declared to be "Swaraj" instead of "Self-Government within the Empire." Gandhi defined it as "Self-Government within the Empire, if possible, and outside, if necessary." The Congress further was no longer tied to "Constitutional" means for the

attainment of Swaraj; but could resort to "all peaceful and legitimate means." The Congress also became a live democratic organisation, with a definite plan of work for the whole year. These changes definitely meant that henceforth Gandhi became the *de facto* leader of the Indian National Congress. Mahatma Gandhi henceforth is the Congress and the Congress is Mahatma Gandhi.

7. *THE NON-COOPERATION MOVEMENT. 1920-1924.*

Gandhi now almost completely dominates the political scene. He launched a fierce propaganda all over the country, for the adoption of his programme. The call to open rebellion was an entirely new one in the history of India: and the people were swept off their feet by his whirlwind propaganda. The march of Hindus and Muslims under one common political leader was also equally new: and since the great days of Akbar and the days of the Indian Mutiny, India had never seen such a spectacle. As he moved from place to place, preaching his new gospel, hundreds of thousands flocked to hear him. To the people he appeared as a prophet, or an *Avatara*, entrusted with the mission of bringing about the downfall of the great British Empire and the re-birth of Indian greatness and independence. His language grew inspired, his articles in the *Young India* and *Navajivan* were read and re-read everywhere, by the people. The British Government in India, he emphatically declared, is a satanic government and he said he was the instrument chosen by God to root it out. A new spirit of political self-consciousness and political self-reliance was born, and people under the matchless leadership of Gandhi, boldly began to take their destiny into their own hands. His influence grew in volume and intensity as leader after leader accepted his lead. C. R. Das, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Lala Lajpat Rai, Vithalbhai Patel, N. C. Kelkar

Dr. Moonje, Babu Rajendra Prasad, Rajgopalachari, Rangaswami Iyenger, Satyamurti, Prakasham, Maulana Mahomed Ali, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Dr. Ansari and a host of other leaders wholeheartedly joined the movement: and the movement became irresistible.

The Non-cooperation movement was meant to weaken the prestige of the Government and put a new spirit of self-reliance into the people. It was essentially a moral gesture on the part of the people : and as such it succeeded remarkably well. A few title-holders gave up their titles: but the titles soon ceased to be badges of honour and prestige. The Government schools and colleges were seriously shaken : they were soon taken by the people as factories for the manufacture of slaves. Hundreds of students came out and either joined National Universities or enlisted themselves as volunteers in the new movement. They constituted the Swaraj Army and did solid work in connection with the movement. The Law-courts and the Councils continued to flourish : but the higher type of lawyer or legislator came out and set a noble example by his sacrifice and devotion to the cause of the country. A fund of a crore (ten million) of rupees was collected : this Tilak Swaraj Fund continued to supply the necessary sinews of war to the movement. The roll of Congress members went up. Spinning organisations sprang up all over the country: and a white cap made of hand-spun became the symbol of the Gandhi movement.

But the most characteristic feature of the movement ...its non-violence. Gandhi had no reservations or ...ions about the paramount necessity of non-violence: ...the whole, the people responded to his call. The Government too maintained a fair degree of self-restraint. The resolution of the Karachi Khilafat Conference declaring it unlawful for "faithful Mussulmans to serve from that day in the army or help or acquiesce in the recruit-

ment" considerably upset the Government. The Ali brothers were tried at Karachi and received a sentence of two years' rigorous imprisonment. The Congress boycott of H. R. H. the Prince of Wales on the 17th of November 1921 and the organisation of a *hartal* on that day further disturbed the equanimity of the Government. There were also occasional disorders in the country at Malegaon and other places : of these the Moplah outbreak at Malbar was undoubtedly the most serious. The Congress campaign also was coming to a head. Under the circumstances, the Government started repression and declared the Congress and Khilafat volunteer organisations illegal at various places. Pandit Motilal Nehru, C. R. Das, Lajpat Rai and thousands of volunteers were arrested. Gandhi was preparing to launch his mass civil disobedience at Bardoli, when the events at Chauri Chura made him halt. At Chauri Chura 21 constables and a Sub--Inspector perished in the flames, as a result of a fire set to the police station by a mob. Gandhi immediately suspended civil disobedience. This was fatal to the movement : there was an outburst of indignation against Gandhi in the Congress ranks, and the Government wisely selected this moment for his arrest. Gandhi was tried and sentenced to six years' imprisonment. The movement naturally languished in his absence, until C. R. Das took up the leadership of the country and gave it a differant direction for a few years.

8. THE OFFENSIVE OF 1929-1930.

Gandhi's serious illness in 1924 led to his release from jail. But the political situation in India had in the meanwhile changed. Gandhi, therefore, allowed the new party of Swarajists to have their own way with regard to the Councils: and he himself concentrated on the constructive programme of the Congress. The Hindu Muslim tension which had begun when Gandhi had gone to jail,

continued in one form or another. Gandhi, therefore, virtually kept away from politics and merely waited and watched. In 1925, C. R. Das passed away, leaving a gap in Indian politics, not easy to fill up. In 1927, the situation began to brighten. The Simon Commission was appointed with a view to suggest the lines on which the Indian Constitution might be revised. The Congress decided to boycott the Commission, because it would not grant to British Parliament the right to decide India's fate. It was a violation of the fundamental principle of self-determination. The Indian Liberals also joined in the boycott, because no Indian was included in the Commission. In the meantime, the Madras Congress modified the creed of the Congress and declared that the goal of the Indian people is Complete National Independence. The Congress leaders further invited an All-Parties' Conference and recommended a constitution for India, on lines acceptable to the people. Mr. M. A. Jinnah came forward at this time with his famous "Fourteen Points" and demanded among other things one-third of the elected seats in the Central Legislature for Muslims, and reservation of seats for them in Bengal and the Punjab on the population basis.

Events were thus happening which showed that a definite change was coming over the psychology of the people. The Calcutta Congress (1928) was presided over by Pandit Motilal Nehru. Gandhi moved the resolution that "subject to the exigencies of the political situation, the Congress will adopt the Nehru constitution in its entirety, if it is accepted by the British Parliament on or before December 31st, 1929; but in the event of its non-acceptance by that date, or its earlier rejection, the Congress will organise non-violent non-cooperation by advising the country to refuse taxation and in such other manner as may be decided upon." The Left Wing of the Congress opposed the Reso-

lution: but their amendment was lost by 973 votes to 1350.

Gandhi now felt that the extremist elements in the Congress were getting stronger and stronger. The revolutionaries also had begun to raise their head. At Lahore, Mr. Saunders, an Inspector of Police, who was supposed to be responsible for Lajpat Rai's death by his attack at the time of the anti-Simon demonstration at Lahore, was assassinated. A bomb was thrown in the Assembly : and two men, Sardar Bhagat Singh and Mr. Dutt, were arrested in connection therewith. Mr. Jitendranath Das, a Lahore conspiracy prisoner, resorted to hunger-strike, to secure decent treatment for political prisoners, and died a martyr's death, after a fast of 64 days. His death made a profound impression on the country's mind; and youth associations sprang up all over the country. A no-tax campaign organised in Bardoli, came to a successful close.

The hour, therefore, for action had come: and Gandhi once more felt that the forces of unrest should seek non-violent and disciplined expression under his leadership. Gandhi backed Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's candidature for the Presidentship of the Lahore Congress (1930). In the meantime, Lord Irwin stated that a Round Table Conference would be held in London and that he had been "authorised by His Majesty's Government to state clearly that in their judgment, it is implicit in the Declaration of 1917 that the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as there contemplated, is the attainment of Dominion Status." The Congress Leaders offered their co-operation to the Viceroy in his effort to evolve a Dominion Constitution for India. The Leaders met the Viceroy, but could not get an assurance from him that Dominion Status would be granted to India. The Lahore Congress passed the resolution that the fight for Swaraj now meant

the fight for Complete Independence. The Congressmen were asked to resign their seats from the Legislatures.

The storm burst in 1930. January 26th was observed all over India as the Day of Independence. The following manifesto was read in public meetings everywhere:

"We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people as of any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil and have the necessities of life so that they may have full opportunities of growth. We believe also that if any Government deprives the people of these rights and oppresses them, the people have a further right to alter it or abolish it. The British Government in India has not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom but has based itself on the exploitation of the masses, and has ruined India economically, politically, culturally, and spiritually. We believe, therefore, that India must sever the British connection and attain *Purna Swaraj* or Complete Independence.

"India has been ruined economically. The revenue derived from our people is out of all proportion to our income. Our average income is seven pice (less than two pence) per day, and of the heavy taxes we pay, 20 per cent are raised from the land revenue derived from the peasantry, and three per cent from the Salt Tax which falls most heavily on the poor.

"Village industries, such as hand-spinning, have been destroyed, leaving the peasantry idle for at least four months in the year, and dulling their intellect for want of handicraft; and nothing has been substituted, as in other countries, for the crafts thus destroyed.

"Customs and currency have been so manipulated as to heap further burdens on the peasantry. The British-

manufactured goods constitute the bulk of our imports. Customs duties betray clear partiality for British manufactures, and revenue from them is used not to lessen the burden on the masses, but for sustaining a highly extravagant administration. Still more arbitrary has been the manipulation of the exchange ratio, which has resulted in millions being drained away from the country.

"Politically, India's status has never been so reduced as under the British régime. No reforms have given real political power to the people. The tallest of us have to bend before foreign authority. The rights of free expression of opinion and free association have been denied to us, and many of our countrymen are compelled to live in exile abroad and cannot return to their homes. All administrative talent is killed, and the masses have to be satisfied with petty village offices and clerkships.

"Culturally, the system of education has torn us from our moorings and our training has made us hug the very chains that bind us.

"Spiritually, compulsory disarmament has made us unmanly, and the presence of an alien army of occupation, employed with deadly effect to crush in us the spirit of resistance, has made us think that we cannot look after ourselves or put up a defence against foreign aggression, or even defend our homes and families from the attacks of thieves, robbers, and miscreants.

"We hold it to be a crime against man and God to submit any longer to a rule that has caused this fourfold disaster to our country. We recognise, however, that the most effective way of gaining our freedom is not through violence. We will, therefore, prepare ourselves by withdrawing, so far as we can, all voluntary association from the British Government, and will prapare for civil disobedi-

ence, including non-payment of taxes. We are convinced that if we can but withdraw our voluntary help and stop payment of taxes, without doing violence even under provocation, the end of this inhuman rule is assured. We, therefore, hereby solemnly resolve to carry out the Congress instructions issued from time to time for the purpose of establishing *Purna Swaraj*."[1]

Gandhi is at his best when he launches these great campaigns of civil resistance. His whole being goes into the business: and his appeals become irresistible. The moment he assumes the leadership of such a campaign, the whole country begins to vibrate with a new life. There is the ring of a prophet in his words: and people become hypnotised by his cry. "This time on my arrest there is to be no mute passive non-violence, but non-violence of the most active type should be set in motion, so that not a single believer in non-violence as an article of faith for the purpose of achieving India's goal should find himself free or alive at the end of the effort."[2]

One of his most brilliant strokes of generalship is his planning of the Salt Tax Satyagraha and the Dandi March. The march of 200 miles on foot from Ahmedabad to Dandi will remain an event of historical importance. The feelings released in the country were truly phenomenal. The country was stirred to its very depths. The Mahatma moved from village to village, spreading his favourite propaganda. The people once more recovered confidence in themselves and believed anything to be possible. Gandhi may truly be called the Napoleon of the War of Non-violence.

9. *GANDHI'S PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE.*

Gandhi is considered a politician by some, and a

saint by others. But whatever he may be, there is no doubt that there is a definite philosophy of life behind all his activity. In the last resort, his whole politics stands or falls with his theory of life. To understand that curious complex called Gandhism, we must try to get hold of his basic creed. The roots of his Non-co-operation Movement, of his Satyagraha, of his passion for Charkha will be all found in it.

Gandhi is not primarily or essentially a builder of systems. He is not a thinker in the sense Plato or Shankara is a thinker. His passion is for a life of activity: he is restless till he translates his dreams and his thoughts into his life and into the life of his country. But his activities are not a mad rush from one movement to another. They are definitely motivated, inspired, and sustained by his fundamental convictions. His life is a long commentary on his creed and an elaborate experiment in search of its verification.

Gandhi is a Hindu not in name merely, but in thought, word, and deed. The central fact about his life is his religion, his Hinduism. His Hinduism is at the back of his whole life. His politics are an application of his Hinduism to the situation in India to-day: his economics are the outcome of his Hinduism. The great method of social change called *Ahimsa*, is nothing but a re-interpretation of the time-honoured Hinduism. Gandhi is a patriot because he is a Hindu: and he is an ardent nationalist because he is a Hindu. He is literally a Hindu first and an Indian afterwards. That is why he really links up in the history of thought with Dayananda Saraswati or Vivekananda or Lokamanya Tilak. He may honour Gokhale as his political *Guru*, but his politics are really different, because he derives his inspiration not from English Liberal Philosophy but from the Ancient Scriptures.

Gandhi's Hinduism, however, is not a dogmatic creed based on a literal interpretation of the Vedas. His Hinduism is almost as liberal as the Hinduism of Raja Ram Mohan Roy. He refuses to be tied down by any texts of any book, however sacred it may be. He is not a literalist. The letter kills, the spirit alone gives life. He believes in the progressive revelation of truth to different prophets of different ages. The humblest of us can establish our contact with God and get our truth from Him. It is not necessary for us to receive truth only from one or a few chosen intermediaries. Truth, therefore, is not the monopoly of any religion or sect, any prophet or Avatara, any book or Shastra. The wind of truth bloweth where it listeth. The organised church or the organised priesthood has no business to pretend that it is the only vehicle of God's wishes. God speaks through a Pariah as well as through a Brahmin, through a layman as well as a priest. "I do not believe in the exclusive divinity of the Vedas. My belief in the Hindu scriptures does not require me to accept every word and every verse as divinely inspired. I decline to be bound by any interpretation, however learned it may be, if it is repugnant to reason or moral sense. I do most emphatically repudiate the claim (if they advance any such) of the present Shankaracharya and Shastris to give a correct interpretation of the Hindu scriptures."[1]

Gandhi, however, is not a perfect anarchist in thought. He believes in the Shastras; he believes even in Gurus (teachers). He is, in other words, a Hindu. Why is he a Hindu? He is a Hindu by birth: he is a Hindu by choice. The ground of his faith is that he finds in Hinduism everything that his soul craves for. Hinduism, as he understands it, is not a mass of unintelligent dogmas: it is a broad, catholic faith giving to its votaries an almost complete freedom for an independent growth,

both for individuals and nations. Gandhi's criterion is sometimes the criterion of rationality: but more often it is the criterion of morality or spirituality. Judged by all these criteria, Hinduism remains a creed which would satisfy the fastidious demands even of Gandhi. "Believing as I do the influence of heredity, being born in a Hindu family, I have remained a Hindu. I should reject it, if I found it inconsistent with my moral sense or my spiritual growth. On examination I have found it to be the most tolerant of all religions known to me. Its freedom from dogma makes a forcible appeal to me inasmuch as it gives the votary the largest scope for self-expression. Not being an exclusive religion, it enables the followers of that faith not merely to respect all the other religions; but it also enables them to admire and assimilate whatever may be good in the other faiths. Non-violence is common to all religions, but it has found the highest expression and application in Hinduism. (I do not regard Jainism and Buddhism as separate from Hinduism.) Hinduism believes in the oneness not merely of all human life, but in the oneness of all that lives."[1]

Hinduism is incapable of being defined. Its singular freedom from dogma or official creed is its greatest recommendation in the eyes of Gandhi. Gandhi however interprets Hinduism in his own way. "If I were asked fo define the Hindu creed I should simply say: search after Truth through non-violent means. A man may not believe in God and still call himself a Hindu. Hinduism is relentless pursuit after Truth and if to-day it has become moribund, inactive, irresponsive to growth, it is because we are fatigued, and as soon as the fatigue is over, Hinduism will burst forth upon the world with a billiance perhaps unknown before."[2] Gandhi however has a creed of his own, of which the cardinal articles are: (a) Belief in God; (b) Belief in oneness of all life; (c) Belief in Avataras (Incar-

nations); (d) Belief in Transmigration of souls; (e) Belief in the paramountcy of spiritual values especially Truth and Love; (f) Belief in Self-Control; (g) Belief in Varnashrama (Castes and stages); (h) Belief in cow protection; (i) Belief in the Vedas, the Upanishads and the Puranas; (j) Belief in the voice of his own conscience. To these he adds that he does not disbelieve in idol-worship.

Gandhi, therefore, feels that essential Hinduism is one of the best religious and philosophic systems in the world and is capable of fulfilling all his highest moral and and spiritual demands. This attitude implies considerable open-mindedness with regard to nature and contents of Hinduism on the part of Gandhi. It is not exactly the rationalistic attitude of a Brahmo. It is certainly very different from the dogmatic attitude of Dayananda Saraswati. It is poles asunder from the die-hardism, the literalism of the so-called orthodox party. The fundamental test for Gandhi is a moral test. With the traditionalists, he agrees to the extent that tradition should not be lightly disregarded. A man's own religion, a man's own past, a man's own culture ought to be to a great extent sacred to him. They have first claim upon his attention and regard, because they have deep roots in the soil, in the consciousness of his people. It is folly, it is madness to expect the country to shake off its past as so much bad legacy. Its past cannot be absolutely isolated from its present or its future. It is not only not possible, it is not desirable to do so. India to-day suffers largely from the disintegration of her ancient culture and the consequent weakening of its hold over the Indian mind.

The scriptures of a nation represent the best religious national traditions. All great religions are more or less true. No religion is perfect. God has inspired the Bibles of all the faiths. There is divine inspiration in not only the Gita, but also in the Bible, not only in Krishna,

but also in Christ. No religion has the monopoly of truth. But each religion is the best for the people who have inherited it or evolved it. Each prophet is the best for the people, to whom he primarily delivers his message. Different ages require different messages: hence each prophet's message is addressed directly to one age and one people. But indirectly every such message has a universal significance. There is here no scope for mutual jealousy, mutual fight, or mutual exclusiveness. There is only one God, one Truth, one Law, and one Reason: but that Divine Truth appears different to different people. This Divine Truth passes through human media; therefore it has necessarily the mark of imperfection. "Even the Vedas, the Koran, and the Bible are the imperfect word of God."[1]

A good Hindu, therefore, does not want any Christian to be a Hindu: but only a good Christian. For each one, his own faith is better than the faith of others. The toleration of other faiths means that if possible we should read and study the scriptures of other people. Such a study leads to broad-mindedness and finer understanding of the essentials of all faiths. There is really one faith: the names of different faith are but labels. Gandhi calls himself a Hindu of the Hindus, but he would not mind being called a Christian, if he is allowed to interpret the Bible in his own way or being called a Muslim, if he is allowed to interpret the Koran in his own way.

There is danger in cosmopolitanism of the wrong type. Gandhi realises it full well. The universal has to be worshipped, therefere, only through the particular. He, therefore, asks each community not to uproot its traditions. "It is my firm belief that the impurity that we see about things that matter in life, the levity with which the student world deals with the greatest and most fundamental questions of life, is due to this uprooting of

tradition from which boys have hitherto derived their sustenance."[1]

Hinduism is not a perfect faith: but it is our own faith. We can, therefore, derive more inspiration from it than from any other faith. Gandhi is a reformer through and through: but his zeal for reform does not affect his love and regard for his faith. "I can no more describe my feeling for Hinduism than for my own wife. She moves me as no other woman in the world can. Not that she has no faults. I dare say, she has many more than I see myself. But the feeling of an indissoluble bond is there. Even so I feel for and about Hinduism with all its faults and limitations. Nothing stirs me so much as the music of the Gita or the Ramayan of Tulsidas."[2]

The essential thing about Hinduism is its capacity for growth. It is not a fossilised thing it is supposed to be. It is a dynamic faith. Change, suitable change, has been always there. "The Smritis were, as is evident from the self-contradictory verses to be found in them, continually passing like ourselves, through evolutionary changes, and were adapted to the new discoveries that were being made in social science. Wise Sings were free to procure new interpretations to suit new conditions."[3] It is up to every reformer that the authority of the Scriptures is not abused. There are good many crimes and stupidities committed in the name of God or of His Holy Writ. This is why the letter of the law kills. My definition of true Shastra is that it is the chosen word that giveth life. Therefore, any text, however ancient it may be described to be, which is, therefore, inconsistent with truth or the universal law of life, is not Shastra."[4]

The essence of a great faith often tends to get lost in the multiplicity of forms and ceremonies set up in the name of that religion. In trivial matters we may submit

to conventions. But when we have lost faith in them, when they have no meaning for us, a continuance of their practice may be a veritable tyranny. But submission in matters of religion, especially where there is a positive repugnance from within and a danger of deceiving our neighbours and ourselves, cannot but be debasing. There are to-day many religious ceremonies, which, whatever meaning and importance they might have had in ages gone by, have neither importance nor meaning for the rising generation. There can be no doubt that it is necessary for this generation to strike out an original path by giving a new form and even meaning to many old ceremonies."[1]

Gandhi's life, in fact, is a ceaseless search after and experimentation in truth. The Shastras have assisted him in the process, not by offering him ready-made solutions, but giving him inspiration in the right direction. The spirit of rational inquiry is far more important to him than an unquestioning obedience to the Shastraic injunctions. The exercise of one's moral sense is still more important in determining the essential spirit of the sacred books. The rights of private judgment and individual conscience are given some say in the interpretation of the Scriptures. But Gandhi knows their limitations. Scriptural scholarship often becomes more a hindrance than a help. The average man, the untutored man has not the requisite learning or judgment to find out for himself always what is right or wrong. The right of interpretation is not confined to a class of priests, nor to any church, nor to any scholars. But that right really belongs to holy men, to saints, to men who have tried sincerely to live religiously. The conscience of every rascal or ass cannot be considered the final court of appeal: but the conscience of the most conscientious and God-fearing goes very far.

Gandhi is not a pure subjectivist giving to each

individual a right to play fast and loose with the sacred writings in the name of his conscience or reason. He has his theory of Adhikara, the theory which gives only to men who fulfil certain spiritual tests, the right to interpret the Shastras. " Knowledge cannot be the prerogative of any class or section. But I can conceive the impossibility of people assimilating higher or subtler truths, unless they have undergone preliminary training, even as these who have not made preliminary preparations are quite unfit to breathe the rarefied atmosphere in high altitudes, or those who have no preliminary training in simple mathematics are unfit to understand or assimilate higher Geometry or Algebra."[1] The holy men, who have lived the life of humanity, service, and devotion to the highest, such men alone have the right to interpret the Scriptures and decide for themselves what is right and what is wrong. The inner voice is the final authority: but whose inner voice ? The conscience of children or of raw youngsters, or of self-willed fellows is not certainly a safe guide. The conscience of many grown-up men, many savages, also is no better guide. Only the conscience which is the ripe fruit of training and discipline has a right to be listened to. " The introduction of conscience into our public life, however, is welcome even if it has taught a few of us to stand up for human dignity and rights in the face of the heaviest odds. "[2]

The Gita is the one book, absolutely sacred to Gandhi. The great lesson which Gita teaches, according to him, is the lesson of Ahimsa (Non-violence). " Himsa is impossible without anger, without attachment, without hatred, and the Gita strives to carry us to the state beyond Satwa, Rajas, and Tamas, a state that excludes anger, hatred etc. " Arjuna refuses to fight, but why ? Not in a spirit of Ahimsa, but in a spirit of false pity. Krishna rightly asks him to fight, because escape out of cowardice or

despair is not the proper way. Killing and being killed in battle is better than cowardice. But the highest Dharma is Ahimsa.

To Gandhi all roads lead to Truth and Non-violence. The Shastras have taught him these truths : but now he is independent of the Shastras, because he has realised them. They have become part of his real being. The ultimate basis of all truth is one's own experience. For Gandhi the fundamental article of his creed is the realisation of Self, of God, of Truth, through Love, or Non-violence. This is the innermost core of his being. His faith, therefore, he calls Hinduism, but it is not merely the sum and substance of Hinduism, but the sum and substance of every great faith.

For Gandhi, therefore, the essence of life is search after God. What is God ? " There is an indefinable mysterious Power that pervades everything. I feel it, though I do not see it. It is this unseen Power which makes itself felt and yet it defies all proof, because it is unlike all that I perceive through my senses. It transcends the senses.

" But it is possible to reason out the existence of God to a limited extent. Even in ordinary affairs we know that people do not know who rules or why and how he rules. And yet they know that there is a power that certainly rules......I do feel...that there is orderliness in the Universe; there is an unalterable law governing everything and every being that exists or lives. It is not a blind law, for no blind law can govern the conduct of living beings and thanks to the marvellous researches of Sir J. C. Bose, it can now be proved that even matter is life. That law, then, which governs all life is God. Law and the Lawgiver are one.

" I do dimly perceive that whilst everything around me is ever changing, ever dying, there is underlying all

that change a living power that is changeless, that holds all together, that creates, dissolves, and recreates. That informing power or spirit is God. And since nothing else I see merely through the senses can or will persist, He alone is.

" And is this power benevolent or malevolent ? I see it is purely benevolent. For I can see that in the midst of death life persists, in the midst of untruth truth persists. Hence I gather that God is Life, Truth, Light. He is Love. He is the Supreme Good.

" But He is no God who merely satisfies the intellect, if He ever does. God to be God must rule the heart and transform it. He must express Himself in even the smallest act of His votary. This can only be done through a definite realisation, more real than the five senses can ever produce. Sense perceptions can be, often are, false and deceptive, however real they may appear to us. Where there is realisation outside the senses it is infallible. It is proved not by extraneous evidence but in the transformed conduct and character of those who have felt the real presence of God within.

" Such experiences are to be found in the experiences of an unbroken line of prophets and sages in all countries and climes. To reject this evidence is to deny oneself.

" This realisation is preceded by an immovable faith. He who would in his own person test the fact of God's presence can do so by a living faith. And since faith itself cannot be proved by extraneous evidence, the safest course is to believe in the moral government of the world and therefore in the supremacy of the moral law, of truth, and love. "[1]

The realisation of God here and now is the supreme ambition of Gandhi's life. All the problems of life can

be solved, all earthly desires disappear only when one sees God face to face. The process is not intellectual merely. It is the vision of God in our whole soul, in our daily lives. There is a spiritual sense in us which alone can feel and visualise His presence. This spiritual sense is not the monopoly of the intellectuals; it is often found in the hearts of the humblest beings.

10. SOCIAL REFORM

Gandhi does not want, therefore, to destroy Hinduism in the name of social reform. But he does appeal from superficial Hinduism to essential Hinduism. If the Hindu mind is to be moved from its age-long slumber, it could only be done in the name of the ancient faith. The Past has a mysterious power over our mind and Gandhi is right in his reading of the mass psychology, when he harks back to our ancient culture. But a die-hard persistence in the mere forms, which to-day constitute Hinduism means certain death for the Hindu society. A theocratic view which insists upon basing the life of a society for ever upon the unchanging and unchangeable foundation of the letter of the holy books, as interpreted by a church or a class of hereditary priests, may make for long life and stability for a society : but it does not spell progress. Go back to the Past by all means, but it is to the spirit of the Past and not its letter.

Hinduism is a living organism, liable to growth and decay. Its very genius makes for necessary change. It itself demands reform, in its very structure. It has become almost moribund to-day, because we are tired, because we take our stand on the mere letter of the law. It will be alive again when we shake off the dust of centuries, and recover the primary source of its inspiration. The Shastras are ever growing. " The Vedas, the

Upanishadas, the Smritis, the Puranas, and the Itihasas, did not arise at one and the same time. Each grew out of the necessities of particular periods, and therefore they seem to conflict with one another...A practice which was good enough in a particular period would, if blindly repeated in another, land people into the 'slough of despond'. Because the practice of animal sacrifice obtained at one time, shall we revive it to-day? Because at one time, we used to eat beef, shall we also do so now?...Shall we revive polyandry? Shall we revive child-marriages? Because we discarded a section of humanity one day, shall we brand their descendants to-day as outcastes?......... Hinduism and all other religions are being weighed in the balance. Eternal truth is one. God also is one. Let every one of us steer clear of canflicting creeds and customs, follow the straight road of truth. Only then shall we be true Hindus."[1]

Reconstruction should be, therefore, undertaken not with a view to westernise our society, but with a view to bring it back to its old traditions. Gandhi appeals to Hindus largely because he is saturated with the spirit of Hinduism. Hinduism fills his being and satisfies his soul as nothing else can do. The Gita moves him in a way which no other book in the world moves him. It is because the spirit of Hinduism is seeking new forms of expression through him, that he moves the minds of Hindus so powerfully. It is not as a student of Mill and Bentham that he asks us to set our house in order. It is as a Hindu steeped in Hindu traditions, full of overflowing love for saints like Prahlad or Tulsidas, that he makes his appeal to the Hindu heart. In him, Hinduism is seeking its fulfilment in consonance with the needs of the age.

The problem which excites him more than any other problem, is the problem of untouchability. He is out to

destroy it root and branch. It is a blot on Hinduism. It is the curse of Hinduism. It is an excrescence of Hinduism. If it were an integral part of Hinduism, Gandhi would prefer to walk out of Hinduism. A drop of poison in a cup of milk will contaminate the whole cup: untouchability is such a drop. Either untouchability must go or Hinduism must disappear.

There are nearly fifty million Hindus belonging to what are called the low castes or the depressed classes. They are called untouchables, because a high caste Hindu thinks it necessary to purify himself by a bath, if he happens to touch them. The lot of these people is very hard, especially in South India. They have to live apart from other communities : they are not allowed to fetch water from the usual wells or rivers: they are not allowed to send their children to the public schools: and so on. Their very shadow is considered polluting to the superior Hindus.

Gandhi's conscience with regard to the sin of untouchability was roused very early in his life. His awakening was not due to his South African experiences or his study of Christianity. He did not like to avoid their touch in his younger days. Later his conviction deepened. He liked scavengering. He took the untouchables into his Ashrama. He identified himself with their cause. He was convinced that so long as the Hindus continued to practise untouchability, they were bound to remain Pariahs in the Empire.

His method, however, is no attack on Hinduism from without. He wants the Hindus to realise the iniquity of the position and mend their ways. There could be no warrant for such a practice in original Hinduism. The spirit of Hinduism is deadly opposed to such an institution. Surely when Hindus, by a deliberate and conscious effort,

not by way of policy but for self-purification, remove the taint of untouchability, that act will give the nation a new strength, born of the consciousness of having done the right thing, and will therefore contribute to the attainment of Swaraj. We are powerless to-day because we have lost the power of cohesion. When we learn to regard these fifty millions of outcastes as our own brethren, we shall learn the rudiments of what it is to be one people. The Alpha of our spiritual training must begin by our coming down from the Himalayan height and feeling one with them in love."[1]

But the peculiarity of Gandhi is that he believes in caste, without believing in untouchability. Gandhi thus dissociates himself at one stroke from the Social and Religious Liberals like Raja Ram Mohun Roy, and connects himself with Swami Dayananda Saraswati and Swami Vivekananda. The institution of caste, if it is properly understood, has always been a beautiful feature of Hinduism. The caste system is based on birth. Every one is born into one caste or other : he cannot change his caste according to his will. The change of caste in one's life-time is not allowed by him. It will lead to fraud and the disappearance of the whole order of Varna (or caste).

There are four castes according to this dispensation. The numberless water-tight compartments called castes and sub-castes should go. The four divisions define a man's duties. The Brahmin's main calling is dedication to the cause of scholarship and research. The special qualities and temperament of a Kshatriya fit him for the work of a soldier. A Vaishya is born for industry and commerce. A Shudra is a manual worker.

The emphasis is here, as usual with the ancient social order, on duties rather than on rights. The idea which unites all castes is that of common service of society,

in ways for which each one is specially fitted, by birth, heredity, nature, temperament, and training. There is here no recognition of class privileges or vested interests. There is insistence on the fundamental right and duty of each human being to do fullest justice to all that he or she stands for, in the interests of the social order. Society is not an aggregate of mechanical and homogeneous units. Hinduism repudiates this conception. Hinduism further repudiates the conception that the qualities which we inherit are of no consequence. Gandhi, therefore, calls this Varnashrama, the law of our being.

The aim of human life is not acquisition of material advantages: and society should not be a mere arena where all the units jostle with each other, in order to get the maximum share of loaves and fishes. The Hindu system of caste puts a check on the instinct of grab. Restraint is a greater law than free expression here. We need control our lower nature in order to liberate our higher energies in the interests of our own spiritual development and the development of society. "Whilst I have said that all men and women are born equal, I do not wish therefore to suggest that qualities are not inherited, but on the contrary, I believe that just as every one inherits a particular form, so does he inherit the particular characteristics and qualities of his progenitors, and to make this admission is to conserve one's energy. That frank admission, if he will act up to it, would put a legitimate curb upon our material ambitions, and thereby our energy is set free for extending the field of spiritual research and spiritual evolution."[1]

Gandhi repudiates the claim of any human being to lord it over any other human being, in any circumstances. Caste does not imply any privilege of that type, any superiority on any one's part. There is only one soul in all of us: and all men are, therefore, essentially equal. The

Hindus are not only equal among themselves, but there is no difference between the Hindus and non-Hindus, in this respect. The Adwaita (monistic) philosophy has taught Gandhi the oneness of all life, of all creation, of all humanity. "In my opinion there is no such thing as inherited or acquired superiority. And it is because I believe in this inherent equality of all men that I fight the doctrine of superiority which many of our rulers arrogate to themselves. I have fought this doctrine of superiority in South Africa inch by inch, and it is because of that inherent belief, that I delight in calling myself a scavenger, a spinner, a weaver, a farmer, and a labourer. He, who claims superiority, at once forfeits his claim to be called a man."[1]

Caste system of Gandhi discourages inter-dining and inter-marriage between castes, but does not stop them. Restraints regarding inter-dining and inter-marriage are essential as a matter of spiritual discipline. But they are not integral parts of Varnashrama. New Hinduism must draw a line between essentials and non-essentials. Gandhi is a vegetarian and is opposed to meat-diet on general grounds. But he does not make a fetish of vegetarianism. "I do not regard flesh-food as necessary for us, at any stage and under any clime, in which it is possible for human beings ordinarily to live. I hold flesh-food to be unsuited to our species. We err in copying the lower animal world, if we are superior to it. Experience teaches that animal food is unsuited to those who would cure their passions. Vegetarianism is one of the priceless gifts of Hinduism. It may not be lightly given up. It is necessary, therefore, to correct the error that vegetarianism has made us weak in mind or body, passive or inert in action."[2] It is, therefore, necessary to practise some restraint and discrimination in matters of diet. But the Hindu religion does not mean a mass of restrictions only. These ought not

to be considered an end in themselves. Many meat-eaters are God-fearing men : while many vegetarians blaspheme God in every act. The caste-system therefore does not neceesarily imply the taboos against inter-dining or inter-marrying or against certain forms of diet.

Gandhi, therefore, is a great social reformer as regards the institution of caste. It does not deserve categorical condemnation. He would rather give it categorical approval. It is one of the contributions of Hinduism to the world-culture. It is a superb way of organising social life. It is based on the great law of heredity. It is meant to avoid social clashes between groups. It shifts the struggle of life from a lower plane of mere vulgar economic competition to a higher intellectual or ethical competition. It is spiritual economics. It enshrines the great ideal of social equality in the only tenable form, without doing harm to individual and group differentiation. But all this is not mere indiscriminate worship of the past or *status quo*. Caste, as it is to-day, is an unmitigated curse. It is a monstrous parody of the caste as it once was, caste as it ought to be. It encourages social stratification. It, above all, connects itself with and strengthens the lie of untouchability. It multiplies endless divisions and sub-divisions in a perfectly artificial way. But Gandhi here will construct and not destroy. He is a great reformer in the guise of a conservative. He loves, he respects, he wants to strengthen, he wants to perpetuate, he wants to develop the essential ideals behind the Hindu institutions: but he would not tolerate the mass of illiberal practices which have grown up in the name of these institutions.

Another beautiful feature of Hinduism according to Gandhi is the attitude towards the Cow. It is symbolic of its attitude towards all dumb, living creation. It means protection of all that lives and is helpless and weak in the

world. The Swaraj would be devoid of all meaning for him so long as it has not insured the protection of the cow. "The central fact of Hinduism ... is cow protection ..... The cow to me means the entire sub-human world. Man through the cow is enjoined to realise his identity with all that lives ...... She (the cow) was the giver of plenty. Not only did she give milk, but she also made agriculture possible. Cow protection is the gift of Hinduism to the world."[1]

The same attitude of respect for ancient ideals, tempered by a sense of necessity of reforming the present, marks Gandhi's approach to the problem of the status of women in modern society. The basis of his whole position is a profound respect for the personality of woman and for the purity of her sex. There is here a crying wrong, requiring to be remedied. "I passionately desire the utmost freedom for our women. I detest child marriages. I shudder to see a child widow, and shiver with rage when a husband just widowed, with brutal indifference contracts another marriage. I deplore the criminal indifference of parents, who keep their daughters utterly ignorant and illiterate and bring them up only for the purpose of marrying them off to some young man of means .... Women must have votes and an equal legal status. But the problem does not end there."[2]

The evil begins with the institution of the Purdah (curtain). Women who are caged in their houses lose touch with actualities of life. They cease "to breathe the fresh air of freedom." They cease to be normal. The custom, therefore, of forcing seclusion on woman is a barbarous custom, doing untold harm to the country. The so-called oriental view of women is based upon a radically wrong relationship between the sexes. Chastity is a great ideal: but can it be secured in this artificial way? There can be no chastity, where there is no assertion of the personality of women : and in the interests therefore

of a full development of the purer type of womanhood, we must let the pure air of freedom blow freely over them. " Chastity is not a hot-house growth. It cannot be superimposed. It cannot be protected by the surrounding wall of the Purdah. It must grow from within, and to be worth anything, it must be capable of withstanding every unsought temptation. It must be as defiant as Sita's. It must be a very poor thing that cannot stand the gaze of men. Men must be able to trust their women-folk, even as the latter are compelled to trust them. Let us not live with one limb completely or partially paralysed. Rama would be nowhere without Sita, free and independent even as he was himself. By seeking to-day to interfere with the free growth of the womanhood of India, we are interfering with the growth of free and independent, spiritual men. What we are doing to our women and what we are doing to the untouchables recoils upon our head with a force thousand times multiplied. It partly accounts for our weakness, indecision, narrowness, and helplessness."[1]

The child-marriage and the ban on widow-remarriage have been typical institutions in Hinduism to-day. Infant marriage is a brutal custom. It is a sin to marry a girl before she has reached monthly periods. It is even necessary to marry a girl for some years after the monthly periods begin. " This custom of child marriage is both a moral as well as a physical evil. For it undermines our morals and induces physical degeneration. By countenancing such customs we recede from God as well as Swaraj. A man who has no thought of the tender age of a girl has none of God. And undergrown men have no capacity for fighting battles of freedom, or having gained, of retaining it."[2]

Connected with this custom and part of it is the practice of marriage of young girls to old men, without

their real consent. Such marriages are absolutely indefensible. Gandhi wants young men of character to form themselves into bands of mercy "pledged, by all just and legitimate means, to prevent child marriages and to promote wherever possible, remarriage of child widows."[1] The widow who is not allowed to remarry because of caste rules, has a very hard lot. A child widow who has never met her husband, is certainly not a widow, because she has not really married. Gandhi asks young men who have a touch of chivalry in them, to seek out widow-girls and marry them. Widow remarriage is not an ideal: but a compulsory widowhood inflicted upon young girls in the name of caste or fate, is certainly a thing to be ashamed of.

Gandhi, however, believes in self-restraint as the very essence of the ideal of life and so also of the ideal of marriage. The ideal state is that of Brhamacharya, complete control of lust, bodily and mental. Such a perfect control over senses is an ideal, like Euclid's line. But such an ideal is necessary to give proper direction to our activities. A life of such self-control is essential for the realisation of our spiritual ideals.

Brahmacharya really means search of Brahman, practice of Brahman. If we are to realise our identity with our highest self and maintain our identity with it, we have to subordinate all our egoistic or individual longings. Brahmacharya is, therefore, a state of the soul. It is not a mere mechanical, or outward celibacy. It means complete freedom from sensual desire in thought, and its expression in word and action. A perfect Brahmachari is not troubled by any passions. Such a one approaches the ideal of God.

Gandhi feels that this is a very difficult state to attain but it is not an impossible ideal. He himself has been

ceaselessly striving to achieve this ideal. He has made his mind proof against the attack of evil ideas during his waking hours. But he has not gained complete control over his thoughts: and in his sleep, undesirable dreams continue to some extent. He has not attained mastery over his sub-conscious self. Such a control would ensure perfect freedom from disease.

The annihilation of carnal desire is considered by him the goal of all mental control. Is there anything unnatural in all this? Sex attraction between man and woman is said to be natural. He says 'no'. "I refuse to believe that the sensual affinity referred to here, can be at all regarded as natural: in that case, the deluge would soon be over us. The natural affinity between man and woman is the attraction between brother and sister, mother and son, or father and daughter. It is that natural attraction that sustains the world. I should find it impossible to live, much less carry on my work, if I did not regard the whole of womankind as sisters, daughters, or mothers. If I looked at them with lustful eyes, it would be the surest way to perdition.

"Procreation is a natural phenomenon indeed, but within specific limits. A transgression of those limits imperils womankind, emasculates the race, induces disease, puts a premium on vice, and makes the world ungodly. A man in the grip of the sensual desire is a man without moorings. If such a one were to guide society, to flood it with his writings, and men were to be swayed by them where would society be? And yet we have the very thing happening to-day. Supposing a moth whirling round a light, were to record the moments of its fleeting joy and we were to imitate it, regarding it as an exemplar, where would we be? No, I must declare with all the power I can command that sensual attraction even between husband and wife is unnatural. Marriage is

meant to cleanse the hearts of the couple, of sordid passions and take them nearer to God. Lustless love between husband and wife is not impossible. Man is not a brute. He has risen to a higher state after countless births in brute creation. He is born to stand, not to walk on all fours or crawl. Bestiality is as far removed from manhood, as matter from spirit."[1]

The ideal of free love is western. Man is unlike other animals: he has reason and he has conscience. The capacity to discriminate between right and wrong and the capacity to act upon one's choice, distinguish man from the inferior creation. Man can rise much above the creation and can fall much below it. The unbridled play of impulse in his case will lead to chaos and misery. The proper ideal for man, therefore, is the realisation of his higher self, whether through marriage or otherwise. Such self-realisation is impossible without self-restraint.

Perfect self-restraint is, however, an ideal. Very few are fitted to practise it all at once. Hence the necessity of marriage for almost all of us. But in a marriage our objective is the attainment of union between two souls. Such a union of souls would make re-marriage both of widows and widowers "unthinkable, improper, and wrong." The glorification of sex is a perverse symptom of our age. It is a mark of disease, not of health. The sexual act is necessary for procreation, but it is not necessary for the promotion of love, or its retention or enrichment. If self-restraint on both sides is voluntary and undertaken with a view to purify the bond of love and conserve the vital energy for a better purpose, it will strengthen the bond of love and not weaken it.

The ideal of self-control, both in marriage and out of it, may be a difficult ideal. But we must not underrate the higher possibilities of human nature. Many things

were considered impossible a hundred years ago, are considered possible to-day. Who can say thus far, and no further, to the capacity for progress, inherent in us? " Human society is a ceaseless growth, an unfoldment in terms of spirituality. If so, it must be based on ever-increasing restraint upon the demands of the flesh. Thus marriage must be considered to be a sacrament, imposing discipline upon the partners, restricting them to the physical union only among themselves and for the purpose only of procreation, when both the partners desire and are prepared for it. "[1]

Gandhi is an anti-hedonist. There is rigour in his whole attitude towards all the pleasures of life. He asks us to remember that we eat food not to satisfy the palate, but to sustain the body. He would not allow or sanction the pleasures of a fine dish or a nice drink. The mastery of the palate is essential for the mastery of the carnal desire. " We take air not for the pleasure of it but to breathe. We drink water to quench our thirst; and so should we take food to satisfy our hunger."[2] He asks people to pluck out their eyes, if they cannot help looking at girls with eyes of lust. He is very severe on these moral lapses, and thinks that it would be better to die than to yield to a temptation to vice.

Prostitution, therefore, is an unmixed evil. Gandhi's reverence for woman enables him to put unlimited faith in the goodness of her nature. He has no contempt for the evil-doer; he has only contempt for the evil. The responsibility for the evil is also collective and more man's than woman's. "Swaraj means ability to regard every inhabitant of India as our own brother or sister. "[3] He wants women to cultivate their self-respect and not allow themselves to be treated by men as mere objects of their lust. They must not waste their time and money on adorning their bodies and heightening their physical charms, to please even their

husbands. Unless woman's divinity of nature is fully recognised both by woman and by man, most of our problems will remain insoluble. The female sex "is the nobler of the two, for it is even to-day the embodiment of sacrifice, silent suffering, humility, faith and knowledge. A woman's intuition has often proved truer than man's arrogant assumption of superior knowledge. There is method in putting Sita before Rama and Radha before Krishna."[1]

Gandhi does not favour artificial birth-control. "Artificial methods are like putting a premium upon vice. They make man and woman reckless. And respectability that is being given to the methods must hasten the dissolution of the restraints that public opinion puts upon one. Adoption of artificial methods must result in imbecility and nervous prostration. The remedy will be found to be worse than the disease. It is wrong and immoral to seek to escape the consequences of one's acts. It is good for a person who over-eats to have an ache and a fast. It is bad for him to indulge his appetite and then escape the consequence by taking tonics or other medicine. It is still worse for a person to indulge in his animal passions and escape the consequences of his acts. Nature is relentless and will have full revenge for any such violation of her laws. Moral results can only be produced by moral restraints. All other restraints defeat the very purpose for which they are intended. The reasoning underlying the use of artificial methods is that indulgence is a necessity of life. Nothing can be more fallacious."[2]

The method of artificial control of brith is repugnant to the moral sense of Gandhi. His fundamental objection to it is that it presents a false ideal to our people, the ideal of weakness and self-indulgence, instead of that of strength and self-control. India's need at all times is an ascetic attitude towards life and its pleasures,

in order that the vitality of the people may be conserved. Artificial methods are symptomatic of our age which wants pleasures but will not have the consequences and responsibilities of those pleasures. The sanctity of marriage, the sanctity of sex will slowly melt away in such an atmosphere.

Gandhi does not believe that India is over-populated. Her population may be large in relation to her existing resources, but not in relation to her capacity of production. "In my opinion, by a proper land system, better agriculture, and a supplementary industry, this country is capable of supporting twice as many people as there are in it to-day."[1] But in the present political circumstances of India, he accepts the necessity of birth-control. But there is only one way to practise it, according to him. Self-control is desirable not only for insuring birth-control but in itself also. The practice of Brahmacharya is fraught with untold blessings : and it is the only method worthy of mankind. In the present stage of our national evolution, it is an urgent necessity as a method of birth-control. "Is it right for us, who know the situation, to bring forth children in an atmosphere so debasing as I have described? We only multiply slaves and weaklings, if we continue the process of procreation, whilst we feel and remain helpless, diseased and famine-stricken.

"Not till India has become a free nation, able to withstand avoidable starvation, well able to feed herself in times of famine, possessing the knowledge to deal with malaria, cholera, influenza, and other epidemics, have we the right to bring forth progeny...When we are engaged in a death grip with a powerful government, we shall need all the strength physical, material, moral, and spiritual. We cannot gain it unless we husband the one thing which we must prize above everything else.

Without this personal purity of life, we must remain a nation of slaves."[1]

II. GANDHI'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS MODERN CIVILISATION.

Gandhi believes in the agelong ideal of Mukti. It is an ideal for individuals and not for society. It is salvation for individual souls. It is emancipation from earthly desires and limitations. It is interpreted as realisation of our self, or realisation of God, or absorption in Brahman. His goal is not nihilistic. What he says of Bnddhistic Nirvana is true also of his Nirvana. " Nirvana is undoubtedly not utter extinction ... Nirvana is utter extinction of all that is base in us, all that is vicious in us, all that is corrupt and corruptible in us. Nirvana is not like the black dead peace of the grave, but the living peace, the living happiness of a soul which is conscious of itself, and conscious of having found its own abode in the heart of the Eternal."[2]

Society, according to Gandhi, is an instrument, enabling individuals to realise their best. His whole attitude is completely individualistic. Society is to him a mere means : the State also is a mere means. Only the individual is an end in himself. Social institutions are therefore, meant to bring out the best that is in us. They are all to be tried by this test. The individual has no obligations towards a social whole, which fails to fulfil this fundamental test. The individual, therefore, according to him is a born rebel : his ceaseless effort is, or should be, to convert social institutions into adequate means of his own self-expression.

Gandhi's whole philosophy hinges on his own view of this self-expression. Here he inherits the ancient

Hindu theory of valuation. Life here and now has no significance except as a training-ground for our higher spirits. Man is essentially a religious being. His one central motive is the ceaseless quest after Truth or God. Faith in this ideal is the one basis of basis in life. It is the one basis for spiritual progress. We are here not to gratify our senses. We are here not to get as large a dose of earthly pleasures as possible. We are not for indulgence, but for an arduous life of spiritual drill and discipline.

The real battle-ground, therefore, is in the mind of man. It is there that the forces of darkness wage a never-ending war with the forces of light. Gandhi is a meliorist. This eternal duel goes on in every conciousness. The great problem in life is, how to overcome the evil in us. Man has gone astray, society has gone wrong, because we have chosen the more seductive path. The real Swaraj lies in the hollow of our hands. It lies in acquiring a complete conquest over our weakness, our vices. " The choice before our youth to-day lies between the way of self-restraint and the way of indulgence and ease, the one leading to salvation and freedom, the other to utter destruction. They are at the parting of the ways. ...The present is for them an age of transition of ideals and of ordeals and the one thing needful for the world,...is Tolstoy's progressive self-restraint, for it alone can lead to true freedom for themselves, the country, and the world. It is we ourselves, with our inertia, apathy, or social abuse, that more than England or anybody else block our way to freedom. And if we cleanse ourselves of our shortcomings and faults, no power on earth can even for a moment withhold Swaraj from us."[1]

To-day, we have begun to lose our faith in ideals. There is a wave of materialism in the air. People are dazzled by the material progress of the West. Modern civilisation is throwing a glamour over the superficial

living of the West. But we must not forget that the values of the spirit alone endure : all else is of the earth, earthy. The mission of India is not in the direction of showing the way to the riches of this earth. It lies in a different direction. India must not lose consciousness of herself. She must be true to herself. Her civilisation is ancient. It has continued when everything else has gone to pieces. " Just as in the West they have made wonderful discoveries in things material, similarly Hinduism has made still more marvellous discoveries in things of religion, of the spirit, of the soul. But we have no eye for these great and fine discoveries. We are dazzled by the material progress that western science has made. I am not enamoured of that progress. In fact, it almost seems as though God in His wisdom had prevented India from progressing along those lines, so that it might fulfil its special mission of resisting the onrush of materialism. After all, there is something in Hinduism, that has kept it alive uptill now...And the reason why it has survived is that the end which Hinduism set before it, was not development along material but spiritual lines."[1]

Gandhi's just charge against modern civilisation is, that it is largely a worship of matter. A civilisation is to be judged by the things it holds dearest. Modern civilisation places human comfort and happiness in the forefront. The whole apparatus of science is to be used in the service of our material comfort. The more we multiply our wants, the more civilised we are considered to be. Gandhi's opposition to the western civilisation is the root of his opposition to the British Government. The satisfaction of animal passions is to him not worthy of a great civilisation. It is the way to hell. " I do not believe that multiplication of wants, and machinery contrived to supply them, is taking the world a single step nearer its goal... I wholeheartedly detest this mad

desire to destroy distance and time, to increase animal appetites and go to the ends of the earth in search of their satisfaction. If modern civilisation stands for all this, and I have understood it to do so, I call it satanic."[1]

Mechanical science in itself is not bad : but it should be a handmaid in the service of humanity. It is the same with art. If science and art become the expression of the higher ideals of humanity, they are positively welcome. But at present they are often the instruments not of the creative spirit of man, but of his acquisitive spirit. They enable a few nations to exploit the rest of humanity. They enable a few capitalists to exploit the poor of their own people. Industrialism to-day is a disease. "I am not opposed to the progress of science as such. On the contrary, the scientific spirit of the West commands my admiration, and if that admiration is qualified, it is because the scientist of the West takes no note of God's lower creation. I abhor vivisection with my whole soul."[2]

Exploitation of the many by the few, in the interests of the earthly greed for money and power of the few, is the essence of modern civilisation. Gandhi asks India not to copy this western civilisation blindly. That way lies ruin, moral and material. The genius of India is different from the genius of the West. India will do well to build on her ancient foundations. The two civilisations are as poles asunder, as regards the basic conceptions they embody. "The distinguishing characteristic of modern civilisation is an indefinite multiplicity of human wants. The characteristic of ancient civilisation is an imperative restriction upon and a strict regulating of these wants. The modern or western insatiableness arises chiefly from want of a living faith in a future state and the existence of a Divine Power. The record condensed above is a warning, if we will take it, against a blind imitation of the West, which one sees so often in the city of India and

especially among the educated classes. Some of the immediate and brilliant results of modern inventions are too maddening to resist. But I have no manner of doubt that the victory of man lies in that resistance. We are in danger of bartering away the permanent good for a momentary pleasure."[1]

The root fallacy, of the advocates of so-called modern civilisation, lies in confounding the externals with the essentials. Civilisation does not primarily mean change in the environment; it means primarily a change in our soul. It does not mean abundance of bodily pleasures and comforts; it really means the triumph of the soul over the circumstance. One cannot worship both God and Mammon. Modern civilisation is the apotheosis of the god of Mammon : we in India have always stood for the worship of a higher God. Gandhi gives in his Indian Home Rule a picture of the western civilisation. " The people of Europe to-day live in better-built houses than they did a hundred years ago. This is considered an emblem of civilisation and this also is a matter to promote bodily happiness. Formerly, they wore skins and used as their weapons, spears. Now, they wear long trousers, and for embellishing their bodies they wear a variety of clothing, and instead of spears, they carry with them revolvers containing five or more chambers. If people of a certain country, who have hitherto not been in the habit of wearing much clothing, adopt European clothing, they are supposed to have become civilised out of savagery. Formerly, in Europe, people ploughed their lands mainly by manual labour. Now, one man can plough a vast tract by means of steam-engines and can thus amass great wealth. This is called a line of civilisation. Formerly the fewest men wrote books that were most valuable. Now, anybody writes and prints anything he likes, and poisons people's minds. Formerly,

men travelled in waggons; now they fly through the air, in train at the rate of four hundred and more miles per day. This is considered the height of civilisation. It has been stated that, as men progress they shall be able to travel in airships and reach any part of the world in a few hours. Men will not need the use of their hands and feet. They will press a button and they will have their clothing by their side. They will press another button, and they will have their newspaper. A third, and a motor-car will be in waiting for them. They will have a variety of delicately dished-up food. Everything will be done by machinery."[1]

The world-civilisation to-day has gone wrong. There is a radical confusion of values. What may be valuable as a mere means to the enrichment of life has been converted into an end in itself. The whole fight of Gandhi is really against the enemies within the gate,- the greed and lust and fear of man. Man has forgotten his real nature and is grovelling in dust. He is hungering and thirsting after his utopian world, in which man goes back to the basic truths of his being, recovers his lost self and fired with one and only one ambition viz, how to realise God, how to approach His Maker. He pictures a world in which there are no lawyers, no doctors, no railways, no elaborate machinery, in which the artificial conditions of life in the twentieth century, which are choking the spirit of man are all rendered conspicuous by their absence. If science becomes an instrument of destruction, if machinery helps the exploitation of the poor, if the whole capitalistic civilisation makes for the impoverishment, moral and material, of the masses, what is the use of them all? In an ideal state they can be all dispensed with, as we dispense with the body in the state of perfection. As things are, we must draw a line between machinery which fulfils the primary

needs of men like the needle and machinery which panders to our luxuries like the motor-car, machinery which is a servant of humanity and machinery which becomes its master. " What I object to, is the craze for machinery as such. The craze is for what they call labour-saving machinery. Men go on 'saving labour' till thousands are without work and thrown on the open streets to die of starvation. I want to save time and labour, not for a fraction of mankind, but for all."[1]

Gandhi is an enemy of capitalism, but not necessarily of capitalists. Capital is necessary for industry and capitalists are capable of being servants of the nation. His economic millennium does not mean economic equality. But industrialism which means exploitation of the many by the few, is a disease. It is industrialism which has enabled a few countries to fasten their unholy yoke upon the innocent people of Asia and Africa. " God forbid that India should ever take to industrialism after the manner of the West. The economic imperialism of a single tiny island Kingdom (England) is, to-day, keeping the world in chains. If an entire nation of three hundred millions took to similar economic exploitation, it would strip the world bare like locusts. Unless the capitalists of India help to avert that tragedy by becoming trustees of the welfare of the masses and by devoting their talents not in amassing wealth for themselves but to the service of the masses in an altruistic spirit, they will end either by destroying the masses or by being destroyed by them."[2]

The profit motive in business is the root of industrialism. Industrial production for use should take the place of production for profit. The fault does not lie in any scheme of production or distribution as such; the fault lies in the motivation of men. Let there be factories, by all means: but they should be nationalised or State-controlled.

Every worker has a claim to a decent living wage and what is more his work must be a joy to him, and not mere drudgery. The conditions of labour should be attractive and ideal. The individual is the one supreme consideration. The saving of labour of the individual should be the object and honest humanitarian considerations and not greed, the motive. "I want the concentration of wealth, not in the hands of a few, but in the hands of all. To-day machinery merely helps a few to ride on the backs of millions. The impetus behind it all is not the philanthropy to save labour, but greed. It is against this constitution of things that I am fighting with all my might."[1]

Things are in the saddle and they ride mankind. The world is too much with us. Man has lost his stature and become a cog in a machine. The god of sensual pleasure or earthly vanity is set up for worship. Morality is considered old-fashioned. Religion passes for superstition. Man has lost the fundamental truth of his being. How could man be really happy under these circumstances? India must not lose her soul. She has the key to the supreme happiness of life in her ancient gospel of Moksha, in her time-honoured way of social living. She has the secret of life. Her civilisation takes its stand on the great principle of truth. Love for God remains the master key of life for her.

12. *POLITICAL OBJECTIVE.*

Gandhi's philosophy is activistic. His love of God is not an inert quality. It is not a mere contemplation of the timeless and changeless beauty of the Absolute. His whole philosophy is a call to action. It is a call to the battlefield. Life to him is not an empty dream; it is intensely real. It can be made into a beautiful dream,

in flesh and blood. The vision of Truth demands that it should be translated into fact. The kingdom of Heaven is to be realised here and now. Faith is a dynamic quality and insists on realisation.

Life is one, indivisible whole. He does not believe in the compartmental division of life. Politics, Economics, Art, Science, Religion are not different departments: they are all diversified expressions of the one soul. "I claim that human mind or human society is not divided into water-tight compartments called social, political, and religious. All act and re-act upon one another."[1] Gandhi does not believe in secularisation of politics. Politics will inevitably degenerate into a scramble for loaves and fishes, if it is divorced from higher idealism. The Liberals tried to rationalise politics: the militant Nationalists tried to emotionalise politics: Gandhi tries to spiritualise it. The driving force in Gandhi's life is the religious force. This religious force does not mean the force of Hindu dogma or any dogma: it is nothing but his faith in the ideals of truth and justice. Politics to him is not opportunism or vulgar self-seeking. Politics is his religion: because he seeks in it the satisfaction of his invincible urge for liberty and justice. "The politician in me," he says, "has never dominated a single decision of mine, and if I seem to take part in politics, it is only because politics encircle us to-day like the coil of the snake, from which one cannot get out, no matter how much one tries ... Let me explain what I mean by religion. It is not the Hindu religion, which I certainly prize above all other religions, but the religion which transcends Hinduism, which changes one's very nature, which binds one indissolubly to the truth within and which ever purifies. It is the permanent element in human nature which counts no cost too great in order to find full expression and which leaves the soul utterly restless, unless it has found itself, known its

Maker, and appreciated the true correspondence between the Maker and itself."[1]

Every activity, therefore, at the hands of Gandhi turns into religion. The spirit of consecration is behind everything that he touches. Life to him is but glorification of God. Men may seek economic well-being, but not for the sake of bodily comfort, but for enabling them to serve humanity and God. Men may seek social reform, or educational reform, or political reform, but these activities have no ultimate appeal to Gandhi's heart unless they are the different ways in which his faith, his religion is fulfilling itself. To spiritualise politics, to spiritualise the whole life of man is his one ceaseless endeavour. It means to bring all our activities into harmony with the central aim of our being. A touch of higher life, of the divine makes the whole world spiritually kin. "I think, if I am not deceived, that at the back of every word that I have uttered since I have known what public life is, and of every act that I have done, there has been a religious consciousness and a downright religious motive ... Throughout 35 years' unbroken experience of public service in several parts of the world, I have not yet understood that there is anything like spiritual or moral value apart from work and action ... 'Not every one that says unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of Heaven, but he who doeth the will of my Father, who is in Heaven.'"[2]

The urge to get individual Moksha dominates Gandhi. The attainment of a timeless state of existence is the one *summum bonum* of his life. He believes in re-birth: but does not want to be reborn, unless to fulfil the objects not attained in this life, like the removal of untouchability. The aim is intensely individualistic. For him the road to his country's emancipation, to the remo-

val of his people's poverty, to the redemption of women, slaves, and the untouchables is the only road to his own salvation. His method of attaining salvation is what is known as Karma-marga, the way of disinterested action, in the service of God. His renunciation is the renunciation not of activity, but of the fruits of activity. "I am a humble seeker after truth. I am impatient to realise myself, to attain Moksha in this very existence. My national service is part of my training for freeing my soul from the bondage of flesh ... I have no desire for the perishable kingdom of earth. I am striving for the kingdom of Heaven which is Moksha ... For me the road to salvation lies through incessant toil in the service of my country and there-through of humanity. I want to identify myself with everything that lives ... So my patriotism is for me a stage in my journey to the land of eternal freedom and peace. Thus it will be seen that for me there are no politics devoid of religion. They subserve religion. Politics bereft of religion are a death-trap, because they kill the soul."[1]

It is reported that when Tilak said, 'I would sacrifice even truth for the freedom of my country,' Gandhi replied, 'I am ready to sacrifice even freedom for the sake of truth.' This reveals a striking attitude of mind. When Gandhi says, that politics without religion do not exist for him, that religion drives him to politics, he means that religion is for him primary and politics are secondary for him. It is not the same thing as to say politics are my religion, the country is my God, the freedom of my country, the highest end and aim of my life. For Gandhi, politics are a means for the fulfilment of his religious ideals: the fight for country's freedom is a means for the realisation of his self, for the attainment of Moksha. Of course, means and end mingle with each other; means become a part of the end. But the highest fascist ideal would place

one's country, one's people above everything else: while for Gandhi truth and non-violence are the highest values. "There is undoubtedly a sense in which the statement is true, when I say that I hold my religion dearer than my country and that therefore I am a Hindu first and a nationalist after. I do not become on that score a less nationalist than the best of them. I simply thereby imply that the interests of my country are identical with those of my religion. Similarly, when I say that I prize my own salvation above everything else, above the salvation of India, it does not mean that my personal salvation requires a sacrifice of India's political or any other salvation. But it implies that the two necessarily go together."[1]

Gandhi is an ardent Indian nationalist. His politics expresses itself in his fight for the Indian nation. India is one nation, as any European country is. Indian unity is not a fact which we owe to the British. Indian disunity, we owe rather to the British. It is true that we have our differences, the differences between the Brahmans and Non-Brahmans, the Hindus and the Muslims, the high-caste Hindus and the untouchables. But these differences are capable of being subordinated to the national idea. India has developed that peculiar genius for assimilation. A foreigner ceases to be a foreigner and gets merged in the one nation. There is the same blood in the veins of most Hindus and Muslims, and they worship the same God. The cultural unity of the Hindus is attested by a thousand facts. The influence of the English conquest of India, the English administration in India have made for division. The idea of division is studiously kept alive by our rulers. "The English have taught us that we were not one nation before, and that it will require centuries before we become one nation. This is without foundation. We were one nation before they came to

India. One thought inspired us. Our mode of life was the same ... Any two Indians are one as no two Englishmen are. Only you and I and others, who consider ourselves civilized and superior persons, imagine that we are many nations."[1]

It is self-evident to Gandhi that Indians are one nation, that there is one Indian culture, and that the struggle of Indians is to revive the spirit of ancient culture in our midst. It is equally self-evident to him that there is one God, one humanity, and one faith, and that God or that humanity or that faith is seeking expression through the time-honoured Indian culture. Indian nationalism is therefore nothing but the demand on the part of the ancient Indian culture to express itself once more through India and her people. There is no exclusiveness or narrowness about it. It is one of the fundamental articles of his faith, that no country can really prosper at the expense of other countries. The predatory nature of modern nationalism is completely repugnant to him. It cannot be the desire of Providence to enrich one man, or one group, at the expense of others. Modern nationalism is nothing but the glorified greed and collective selfishness of one group. It exalts one's own culture, race, nation, country above everything else. Gandhi worships his country or nation but only as one of the expressions of the spirit of God. He is seeking the realisation of his deepest self and the realisation of the deepest self of others, through his fight for his country and his people.

India, however, has the first claim on his attention. It is the land of his birth. " To love the little platoon we belong to, " said Burke, " is the germ of all public affections." There is humility and love in confining one's services to one's country, in the first instance. The service of family claims our attention first: because in most cases we can

hardly go beyond it. It all depends upon how one serves one's family or one's little group. The right way is to serve humanity through one's family or one's country. If every one practises his humble role perfectly, we will have an ideal State. " Under this plan of life, in seeming to serve India to the exclusion of every other country, I do not harm any other country. My patriotism is both exclusive and inclusive. It is exclusive in the sense that in all humility, I confine my attention to the land of my birth. But it is inclusive in the sense that my service is not of a competitive or of antagonistic nature...Patriotism based on hatred 'killeth life,' and that patriotism based on love 'giveth life.' "[1]

The doctrine of Nationalism is certainly a mark of our limitation. It is that our hearts are not always broad enough to love all peoples, that our understandings are not capable enough to appreciate all cultures. It is also not given to every one to be capable of serving humanity directly. But it is given to all of us to serve humanity through our service to our nation, and our nation through our service to our little group, be it family or caste or community. The content of our patriotism is the only thing which matters. The quality of our public life alone counts. If we are not able to help ourselves, how can we pretend to help others? " A drowning man cannot save others. We must try to save ourselves. Indian nationalism is not exclusive, nor aggressive, nor destructive. It is health-giving, religious, and therefore humanitarian. India must learn to live before she can aspire to die for humanity. The mice, which helplessly find themselves between the cat's teeth, acquire no merit from their enforced sacrifice."[2] India very badly needs the right type of nationalism. It is based on love, not on hatred: it is worship of the highest but through one's own country.

The world, to-day, is yearning to see the dawn of

a new day, when nations would give up their worship of themselves and accept a willing surrender to the cause of inter-nationalism and humanity. But how is that to be done, as long as we pay homage to the doctrine of the superiority of others ? It is this national arrogance which must go. The doctrine of inequality is working havoc to-day. Nations, groups, races, castes, classes are all busy trying to maintain and perpetuate their superiority over others. In their hurry to elbow others out and carve for themselves a position of exceptional privilege, they have forgotten the fundamental religious truths of the unity of God and brotherhood of humanity. The differences of age, height, skin, intellect are temporary and superficial. " The soul that is hidden beneath this earthly crust, is one and the same for all men and women belonging to all climes. What is true about men is also true about nations, which are but groups of men. The false and rigid doctrine of inequality has led to the insolent exploitation of the nations of Asia and Africa."[1]

But if we want to establish an inter-national order, it is necessary that all the nations of the world should recognise the rights of one another for equal treatment. It is therefore necessary that the nations which have not yet been properly organised should organise themselves and become self-conscious, coherent units. "In my opinion, it is impossible for one to be an internationalist without being a nationalist. Internationalism becomes possible only when nationalism becomes a fact i. e. when peoples belonging to different countries have organised themselves and are able to act as one man. It is not nationalism that is evil, it is the narrowness, selfishness, exclusiveness which is the bane of modern nations, which is evil. Each wants to profit at the expense of, and rise on the ruin of the other. Indian nationalism I hope, has struck a different path. It wants to organise

itself or to find full self-expression for the benefit and service of humanity at large. Any way, there is no uncertainty about my patriotism or nationalism."[1]

It is this force of integral nationalism which is to make India one unit. This postulates on the one hand a common front and a position of equality with regard to other nations, and a united front and harmonious fusion in one whole of the different classes and groups within the whole. Nationality of a type there always has been in India : but nationalism is a new force. Gandhi's mission is to convert all the different sections of India's population into one single whole. This means economic, political, and social unification of India. The whole point about this unification is, that it is to be a spontaneous, voluntary process from within under the leadership of Gandhi.

Among the Hindus, he has been trying to reconcile the Brahmans and Non-Brahmans, the untouchables and the so-called higher castes. He does not want caste to go: he wants the superiority and inferiority complex to go. Gandhi's nationalism does not mean that our nation should attain the same wealth and power as other nations have done. Such a nationalism finds its peculiar support in the Hindu doctrine of Varna, the sole subject of which was to place a restriction upon our grab, in order that each one of us may be able to contribute our best to society. Equality among nations, among individuals, among castes, has only one meaning for him that each unit should be able to do full justice to its latent capacity for contributing ultimately to the spiritual well-being of humanity. Society is to him a partnership not in power or wealth, but in the production of spiritual perfection. It is his Varna which is to prevent the competitive strife between different individuals and groups on the lower plane of material well-being.

Nationalism is further to turn communalism into a constructive force for the good of India. He wants Hindus to be better Hindus and Muslims to be better Muslims, in order that both may be better Indians. Each faith has a message for humanity: but the followers of each faith should first seek their spiritual fulfilment through their respective religions. He, therefore, does not dream of Hinduising India, but he would not allow India to be converted to Islam either. Religion is not a force which divides people and makes them quarrel; it is a force which makes the purest type of solidarity possible. It is on the religious plane that Gandhi would unify India. Each individual is here to realise his self : each individual exists in order that he may realise his God. Each community exists also for this object only. Is the God of Hindus different from the God of Muslims ? Is the message of the Koran different from the message of the Gita ? Indian nationalism means the religious fulfilment of India's different communities by their firm adherence to great principles of their respective faiths. India is meant to be not a vast laboratory, nor a huge factory, but a magnificent temple for the worship of one God by different communities, different individuals, in their own way.

The root weakness of India's social system is mutual distrust between different communities. The whole quarrel really centres round loaves and fishes. The basis of communal differences is material greed. The foreign government cleverly foments this weakness and has set up so many traps for our misguided communities. The seats in Legislatures or Executives or Municipalities, and the posts in the hands of the Government, these constitute the main lure to each community. The two communities should try to solve all their quarrels by mutual agreement. There should be no recourse to a third party. The best way is to argue ourselves into unity. The worst way is to fight it

out by means of violence. But under no circumstances, the communities should learn to lean upon an outside agency. The assumption should be that in spite of internal differences, these communities are conscious of their common interests to the extent that the Hindus would trust Muslims more than they would trust an outsider and *vice versa*. The differences relate to certain details of religious belief and practice, like music before the mosques or the killing of cows or to political matters. Mutual trust must be the foundation of all attempts. Mutual give and take will solve most problems. But no solution should be accepted which defeats the fundamental purpose of all solutions, viz. the eventual building up of a united India and an efficient India. In the matter of services, the principle of efficiency alone should count. The allocation of seats in Legislatures should be determined by mutual agreement: but if necessary, the majority community should give a blank cheque to the minority communities. Here also Gandhi takes his stand in the last resort on the assumption that our nationalism should not be primarily the expression of material interests, but of the spiritual need to evolve the God within us.

It is the same with another cleavage among our people. That cleavage is not peculiar to India, but is almost a universal phenomenon. It is the division of the people into the rich and the poor. Here as elsewhere Gandhi does not propose to create a new order based on the suppression of these differences. The essential mark of his new order is the reconciliation of all these differences, in the light of the great ideal of Indian Nationalism. The poor, he believes, will be always with us. The labouring population will always be there. This is a part of the order of nature, a part of the dispensation of Providence. The only equality we should strive to bring about is the equality of service. Equality of material possessions does not appeal to him as a necessary or desirable ideal. It puts the emphasis

in the wrong place. But there should be no exploitation of the poor by the rich, of labour by capital, of farmers by landlords. There should be no arrogant assumption of superiority. There should be only a spirit of common service animating both, and uniting them in their devotion to their country, their common humanity, and God. Here again he thinks that the basic ideal of nationalism of the humanitarian type, if rightly understood, will give us a spiritual unity of purpose, of outlook, without destroying these incidental and perhaps inevitable differences. " Every palace that one sees in India is a demonstration not of her riches, given to the few, who owe them to the miserably requited labours of the millions of the paupers of India."[1] There is here unmitigated contempt for the unregenerate capitalist. What we need is not the expulsion but the conversion of the rich. " Nor need our merchant princes ruin themselves for the sake of the country...I admit that they will have to give up commercial gambling, speculation, and palaces out of all proportion to their surroundings, and be satisfied with an income bearing some relation to the condition of those for whom and with whom they would trade. In other words, instead of taking part as they are now doing, in bleeding the villages, they would be making some tardy return to those on whom their prosperity has depended. The story of the belly and other members has an eternal application. The toiling millions are the belly. The merchants and others are the members. They must wither if the belly is starved. Those who have eyes can see that the belly has been shamefully starved for a long enough period. The withering of the members must follow as the night follows the day. "[2]

Gandhi admires the communistic ideal, but he would prefer a religious type of communism, voluntarily brought about. Private property may go as a result of the volun-

tary acceptance of the ethical ideal of non-possession by the people. The ideal is excellent; but the means for its propagation are not proper. "But from what I know of Bolshevism it not only does not preclude the use of force but freely sanctions it for the expropriation of private property and maintaining the collective state ownership of the same. And if that is so I have no hesitation in saying that the Bolshevik regime in this present form cannot last for long. For it is my firm conviction that nothing enduring can be built on violence. But be that as it may, there is no questioning the fact that the Bolshevik ideal has behind it the purest sacrifice of countless men and women who have given up their all for its sake, and an ideal that is sanctified by the sacrifices of such a master spirit as Lenin cannot go in vain: the noble example of their renunciation will be emblazoned for ever and quicken and purify the ideal as time passes."[1]

Gandhi, in fact, is not a communist: but he insists upon championing the cause of the poor more than anything else. The fact of enforced poverty, starvation, ignorance of the poor stirs him profoundly: and in fact his religion virtually is the service of God through the service of suffering humanity. Every one has a right to work, and a right to a minimum of subsistence. In order that this ideal may be realized, he proposes that the means of production of elementary necessities of life should remain in the control of the masses. "These should be freely available to all as God's air and water are or ought to be; they should not be made a vehicle of traffic for the exploitation of others. Their monopolization by any country, nation, or group of persons would be unjust."[2]

All trusts, all monopolies, all concentrations of capital are unhealthy: but Gandhi sees no harm in the existence of private capitalists, merchants, managers and landlords.

There should be harmony between capital and labour, employer and employees, landlords and tenants. How is that harmony to be maintained? Society must evolve a concept of justice regulating the relations between these classes. The more this concept becomes effective, the happier and healthier the society becomes. " The relation between mill-agents and mill-hands ought to be one of father and children, or as between blood-brothers. It is bad taste to refer to capitalists as monsters and employees as servants. The attitude is a negation of Ahimsa inasmuch as our ideal demands that all our wealth, and all our brains should be devoted solely to the welfare of those who, through their own ignorance and our false notions of things, are styled labourers or 'servants'. What I expect of you, therefore, is that you should hold all your riches as a trust to be used solely in the interests of those who sweat for you, and to whose industry and labour you owe all your position and prosperity. I want you to make your labourers co-partners of your wealth."[1]

Society is an organic whole, made of various parts, each of which should perform its proper functions in relation to the needs of the organism as a whole. Castes or Varnas mean that differentiation of parts and their subordination to the whole. Races or religions also mean the diverse fulfilment of the essential message of God in diverse ways, but without affecting the purity and essential oneness of that message. Classes are also meant to carry out the fundamental purposes of society in an adequate way. The burden of hard work is borne by labour; the burden of organisation is borne by the capitalist. In all this there is the realisation of a common plan, of the basic ideals of society, of "unity in variety". It is only when a part forgets and sets itself up as a whole that trouble begins. The tyranny of the higher castes in Hinduism is a denial of Dharma: it is not caste, but its abuse, its dis-

tortion. Communalism is an equally serious evil. Capitalism is an equally serious evil. The tyranny of one community begets opposition in the other community. The tyranny of capital begets the far worse tyranny of labour. The moment any part of society forgets its duty to the whole it sets up a despotism. Violence generates violence. Gandhi wants each section of society to take its stand upon the fundamental concept of justice and fight its battles for the assertion of justice in a perfectly non-violent way. Non-violence of this type is the realisation of the fact that they are integral parts of a common whole and to injure one is to injure other parts as well as the whole. Violence ignores this common unity and acts accordingly. Violence therefore serves to break the unity of the whole which consists in the feeling of the interdependence pervading all the parts. Non-violence, being born of the consciousness of unity as fundamental, leads to the deepening and purifying of the unity. This is the meaning of Gandhian nationalism. " In India also we have this blight (of communalism)...It is totally opposed to nationalism. And you want as you must want Swaraj...and that self-government you will not have—I was going to say you cannot have—unless you speak with the voice of one nation and not with the voice of Christians, Musalmans, Buddhists, Hindus, Europeans, Sinhalese, Tamils and Malays...We are striving; we are groping in the dark; we are trying to suppress provincialism; we are trying to suppress racialism; we are trying to suppress religionism; we are trying to express nationalism in its fullest form, but I am ashamed to confess to you that we are still far from it."

The creation of a national front in India is the essential work of Gandhi. This front would enable us to consolidate our strength and develop a perfect unity of will and purpose, both towards classes and castes at home

and towards other nations abroad. His nationalism is an antithesis not only to racialism and commualism, but also to imperialism. Imperialism is the right of one nation to govern another, to exploit another; nationalism means that each nation should possess that power and right to govern its own affairs. The major conflict in India, round which Gandhi's whole life centres, is this conflict between the right of India to determine her own line of action in her own way, and the right of Great Britain to prescribe the proper type of behaviour and the proper type of constitution to Indian people. Here also Gandhi's fundamental principles help him to build bridges and when the bridges are not available, to try to reconcile the conflicting interests by his new method of non-violence. The organisation of society is based on the proper functioning of each of these different principles, in relation to the basic ideals of that society, without interfering with the proper functioning of the other equally valid principles. In our Father's house, there are many mansions: the proper thing is to try to effect a federation of interests, a reconciliation of the terms of antithesis without unduly emphasising and consequently unduly ignoring any one of the principles. Society becomes richer, more diversified, more balanced, if each of the legitimate groups takes its proper place and plays its proper part in the working of the social scheme as a whole. Central in the whole scheme of life is Gandhi's faith in God, and faith in the deeper humanity of all the creation of God. There is no high and there is no low in God's world. God has created diversity of faiths, of races, of classes, of cultures, with a view to fulfil Himself in a variety of ways. There is a cultural pluralism in the world. There may be a peaceful contest between these, a peaceful way of settling their differences and reconciling their view-points. The only right which each of these tendencies has is the right to express the divinity within it, in order that it may fulfil its destiny.

No individual, on group, no race, no nation has an absolute right to exist and to do anything it likes. This is autocracy. This is tyranny. This is egoism. It is the root of all evil. It is the dethronement of the will of God and the enthronement of the will of some selfish interest in its place. The meanest individual, the humblest organism has the same right to exist and to develop as the so-called mighty individuals or groups. The basis of that right is the same: and the limits within which it is justified in exercising that right are prescribed by that fundamental basis. God alone has the absolute right to exist: God alone is a perfect and final end in Himself. Every one else has a right to carry out His purposes: but no right to go beyond that. If this purpose animating the whole and the purpose animating the parts is not properly remembered and acted upon, there will be strife, there will be anarchy. Gandhi's whole heart is set on the reinstatement of God's will in human affairs. His nationalism is the fundamental demand of Indian people to express themselves in their own way, in order that they may be able to achieve the objects of a Divine Providence in this world. The humanitarian basis of his nationalism is its most essential feature, because it prevents it from degenerating into the western type of nationalism, which asserts the right to exist and flourish irrespectively of any ulterior purpose. "For me patriotism is the same as humanity. I am patriotic because I am human and humane. It is not exclusive. I will not hurt England or Germany to serve India. Imperialism has no place in my scheme of life."[1]

The right to self-government is inherent in every human being, in every group or nation. Gandhi repeats Tilak's cry that Swaraj is our birth-right. The right to Swaraj is not to be established by demonstrations or arguments: it is innate in every people. If the right to

self-government is an inalienable right of every nation, the right to govern others falls to the ground. No nation is so wise or perfect as to be made the custodian of the interests of any other nation. Imperialism, therefore, is in itself a radically unsound position. It is usurpation of the right of another nation to self-government. " Man is a self-governing animal and self-government necessarily includes the power to as much commit errors as to set them right as often as they are made...After all, each one must be a law unto himself, the invariable condition being that he must then walk in the fear of God and therefore continually keep on purifyiug his heart...I do think that independence of each country is a truth in the same sense and to the same extent as the independence of each man is. There is, therefore, no inherent incapacity for self-government in any country or nation, and therefore no inherent capacity for governing other nations."[1]

This is the basis of Gandhi's faith in democracy. Democracy implies that each group is an end in itself : no one has a right to use it as a mere means to an end. It further implies that each individual is also in the last resort an end in him or herself, and no one has a right to dominate or exploit him or her. This is the main argument of Gandhi against all tyrannies and exploitations, whether of higher castes over the lower castes, of the rich over the poor, of one community or nation over another. It does not mean that all nations or individuals are equal in native endowments or acquired capacities. It does mean, however, that different individuals or different nations are fitted for different tasks, that the mission of each group or individual is unique, that for the fulfilment of that mission every individual should be left to himself, every nation should be kept free, that there should be no arbitrary imposition of the

yoke of one upon the others in the name of so-called superiority. Gandhi's faith in democracy is based on his faith in human personality. He takes it that that personality is implicit in everyone of us, in everyone of the peoples inhabiting the earth. Any use of force on the part of one personality in relation to other personalities is a sin against God and man, is a denial of the fundamental right of every being to be oneself. The right to be oneself, the duty to be oneself, is the greatest of all rights and duties: and no human scheme has any business to thwart it or deny it. Capitalism, Racialism, wrong type of Nationalism, Imperialism, are all negations of the principle of democracy more or less, the principle of the right divine of each of God's creations to go one's way, to fulfil the call of destiny, the call of one's own innermost being.

The Indian struggle becomes thus a struggle for the assertion of democracy. It is a fight for Swaraj. What, then, is Swaraj? Swaraj is the goal of India's social, political, economic struggle. It is the right of India to be herself. Gandhi is inclined to lay greater stress on the process of evolving Swaraj, than Swaraj itself. The process is a process of self-purification. It is a growth from within. It is an effort to create that mentality which makes for Swaraj. It is true that Swaraj is our birth-right: but that birth-right has to be made real. It means the essential right of every being to develop fully the stature of which it is capable, unhindered by any external or internal obstruction. The Indian nation, therefore, has the right to exist and the right to grow. This right has to be asserted not merely on public platforms, or in petitions to the Government, but in actual politics. The theoretical enunciation of that right, the academic vindication of it do not carry us anywhere. We should rather be ashamed of perpetual talking of it, when we cannot put any content into the fight and make it real.

Gandhi's great contribution to Indian political thought consists in his turning the mind of the people to some extent from outside to inside, from results to processes, from the externals and forms to the substance. The process of evolution is mental, subjective: but the process is its own justification, its own reward. The process is comprehensive and requires a state of mind in the nation which can do full justice to all national problems in a full, democratic spirit. "Real organic Swaraj is a different question. That freedom which is associated with the term Swaraj in the popular mind, is no doubt unattainable, without not only the removal of untouchablity and the promotion of heart unity between the different sections, but also without removing many other social evils that can be easily named. That inward growth which must never stop we have come to understand by the comprehensive term Swaraj. And that Swaraj cannot be had so long as walls of prejudice, passion, and superstition continue to stifle the growth of that stately oak."[1]

True Swaraj is a state of mind. It can only be, therefore, a growth; it cannot be a graft. It cannot be, wrested from outsiders; it has to be achieved by our own will-power. Its whole nature, its whole value lies in this effort on our part. The spirit of perpetual vigilance, of perpetual self-sacrifice are of its very essence. It is a ceaseless striving: it is not a state of mind in which we can rest. It is not the ripe fruit which is going to fall into our laps at the end of our journey. It is essentially not a political result, but a moral process: not a paper constitution, but an all-round national regeneration. The emphasis must be placed on the essential nature and requirements of our situation. Foreign government is a hindrance in our way: but it is not the only hindrance nor the main hindrance. It is a symptom, it is not a disease. Our fight must be not with symptoms, but the

roots of the disease. Our fight therefore is a hindrance against hindrances, and the real hindrances are internal rather than external. Political fight merely sets the stage for the essential spiritual fight. It may serve to stimulate our enthusiasm, to focus our attention, but the real fight is much deeper than that. This attitude differentiates Gandhi's politics from the earlier liberal and nationalist politics. " It is, I know, a pleasurable pastime (and I have sufficiently indulged in it as you know) to strive against the powers that be, and to wrestle with the Government of the day, especially when that Government happens to be a foreign Government and a Government under which we rightly feel we have not that scope, which we should have and which we desire, for expansion and fullest self-expression. But I have also come to the conclusion that self-expression and self-government are not things which may be either taken from us by anybody or which can be given us by anybody. It is quite true that, if those who happen to hold our destinies, or seem to hold our destinies in their hands, are favourably disposed, are sympathetic, understand our aspirations, no doubt it is then easier for us to expand. But, after all, self-government depends entirely upon our internal strength, upon our ability to fight against the heaviest odds. Indeed, self-government, which does not require that continuous striving to attain it and to sustain it, is not worth the name. I have, therefore, endeavoured to show both in word and in deed, that political self-government-that is self-government for a large number of men and women,–is no better than individual self-government and therefore it is to be attained by precisely the same means that are required for individual self-government or self-rule, and so as you know also, I have striven in India to place this ideal before the people in season and out of season, very often much to the disgust of those who are politically minded merely."[1]

The fitness for Swaraj is more important than Swaraj. Without such a fitness, we cannot gain it; without fitness, we cannot retain it. If Swaraj is not to be an imposition from above, it must be the product of our own exertions and sacrifices. If Swaraj is not to be a gift, offered to a willing but unappreciating and incapable people, it must be won by us. The test of our willingness, our capacity lies in the capacity we acquire of getting it and running it. If we have no real hunger for food, if we have no capacity to digest it, that food is likely to be poison in our system; it will choke us, hurt us, it cannot help us. The demand for Swaraj is, therefore, demand for organic growth from within. It is not a demand for a change in forms, but a change in substance. Gandhi, therefore, throws his whole weight into the process of training, of evolution. The means are all important, the end is a part of the means. A Swaraj obtained in a different way will be a different type of Swaraj. A Swaraj which is a gift of the authorities: a Swaraj which is obtained by constitutional fight in the Councils: a Swaraj acquired by violence: these agree merely in having a common name. They are all really different. It is the nature of the goal which determines the means. It is equally true that it is the nature of the means which determines the goal. It is, therefore, necessary to define and redefine the goal in various ways in the terms of the essential requirements of the country. Swaraj broadly means freedom. But what is the nature of that freedom? Here is one view of freedom, dearest to Gandhi's heart. "All outward oppression is but the shadow and effect of the real oppression within. For ages, the oppressed have cried for liberty, and a thousand man-made statutes have failed to give it to them. They can give it only to themselves, they shall find it only in obedience to the Divine statutes which are inscribed upon the hearts. Let them resort to the inward freedom, and the shadow of oppression shall no more darken the

earth. Let men cease to oppress themselves, and no man shall oppress his brother. Men legislate for an outward freedom, and yet continue to render such freedom impossible of achievement by fostering an inward condition of enslavement. They thus pursue a shadow without, and ignore the substance within. All outward forms of bondage and oppression will cease to be when man ceases to be the willing bond-slave of passion, error, and ignorance."[1] Gandhi remarks that we shall get outward freedom in exact proportion to the inward freedom to which we may have grown, at a given moment. The problem of Swaraj, therefore, is more radical than the problem of attaining political autonomy. What we need, above all, is character, character which as much respects the freedom of others as well as of oneself, which is fearless in all circumstances, which would willingly sacrifice lust for possessions, power, and comfort, at the altar of the common good, which would place truth and non-violence above all earthly considerations. The root of the problem is not political, nor economic, but moral and psychological. The forms of government are not so important: the finest constitution of the world has no meaning unless you have got the mentality which can run it. The most democratic political system will be rendered autocratic, if the people are not equal to the responsibilities involved in it. The most autocratic system can be rendered democratic if men and women subject to it are self-respecting, erect-minded men and women. Swaraj would be a Will O' the Wisp, if we do not realise what it means. Indian slavery to-day is the outcome of Indian sinfulness: Indian freedom therefore can only be the outcome of Indian purity and truthfulness. "I am superstitious enough to believe that all such sins that a nation commits react upon it physically. I believe that all these sins of ours have accumulated together to reduce us to a state of slavery. You may get the finest constitution that is conceivable drop-

ping upon you from the House of Commons. It will be worthless if there are not men and women fit enough to work that constitution. Do you suppose that we can possibly call ourselves men worthy of ruling ourselves or others or shape the destiny of a nation containing thirty crores so long as there is one single widow who wishes to fulfil her fundamental wants but is violently prevented from doing so?"[1]

The essence of Swaraj is non-violence. It is non-violence expressing itself in the purest love of God and of humanity. It is the positive fulfilment of the deepest and most spiritual yearnings of a nation's soul in all constructive ways serviceable to humanity. It is the spirit of truth let loose to find out what its realisation means, to find out its adequate institutional expression in the country. It is the spirit of justice asserting itself in all activities of life–social, political, and economic. "Swaraj does consist in the change of Government and its real control by the people, but that would be merely the form. The substance that I am hankering after is a definite acceptance of the means and, therefore, a real change of hearts on the part of the people. I am certain that it does not require ages for Hindus to discard the error of untouchability, for Hindus and Musalmans to shed enmity and accept heart-friendship as an eternal factor of national life, for all to adopt the Charkha as the only universal means of attaining India's economic salvation, and finally for all to believe that India's freedom lies only through non-violence, and no other method. Definite, intelligent, and free adoption by the nation of this programme, I hold, as the attainment of the substance. The symbol, the transfer of power, is sure to follow, even as the seed truly laid must develop into a tree."[2]

Swaraj is the capacity on the part of the nation to

run its own affairs, with the minimum of control and interference from above, whether by a foreign Government or an indigenous Government. Gandhi's ideal very nearly approaches the anarchist ideal of dispensing with coercion altogether in the management of human affairs. Government is a necessary evil. The less of it we have the better. "Whereas, in truth, a Government that is ideal governs the least. It is no self-government that leaves nothing for the people to do. That is pupilage—our present state."[1] "Self-government means continuous effort to be independent of government control, whether it is foreign government or whether it is national."[2]

Gandhi, therefore takes a wider and deeper view of the problem of India than had been so far taken by any school of politics in India. But he tries to build a bridge from his ideal world to the world of the real. Politics cannot be dramatised by a view, however correct it may be, which removes the struggle altogether from the plane of political and economic actuality to the plane of the internal struggles of a nation's soul with a view to acquire self-mastery. The essence of Swaraj still is freedom on the part of India to make her choice of government. It is the right to grow according to her lights, unfettered by any outside agency. If the country chooses to have Parliamentary form of Government, Gandhi has no objection to it. "In so far as I can see, Swaraj will be a Parliament chosen by the people with the fullest power over the finance, the police, the military, the navy, the courts and the educational institutions...Under that Swaraj, the nation will have the power to impose a heavy protective tariff on such foreign goods as are capable of being manufactured in India, as also the power to send (or not to send) a single soldier outside India, for the purpose of enslaving the surrounding or remote nationalities. The Swaraj that I dream of will be a possibility

only when the nation is free to make its choice both of good and evil."[1]

Swaraj, therefore, means the freedom of the nation's will to choose its own way of life. Gandhi is a strong democrat of a type. He would rest everything upon people's will. He would do away with force in every shape and form. The nation must have the right to go wrong. "Complete freedom of opinion and action without interference with another's right to equal freedom of opinion and action" is considered by him the fundamental requirement of Swaraj. It is force which prevents the normal expression and development of the nation's self. If the Indian people are not allowed to organise their own Swaraj, in their own non-violent way, the Swaraj can never grow. The fight for Swaraj, therefore, becomes the fight for this elementary right of free thought and speech. The fight for Liberty is thus in the first place the fight for liberties. "Liberty of speech means that it is unassailed, even when the speech hurts. Liberty of the press can be said to be truly respected only when the Press can comment in the severest terms upon and even misrepresent matters, protection against misrepresentation or violence being secured not by an administrative gagging order, not by closing down the press but by punishing the real offender, leaving the press itself unrestricted. Freedom of association is truly respected, when assemblies of people can discuss even revolutionary projects, the State relying upon the force of public opinion and the civil police, not the savage military at its disposal to crush any actual outbreak of revolution that is designed to confound public opinion and the State representating it...The restoration of free speech, free association, and free Press is almost the whole Swaraj."[2]

Gandhi's Swaraj is positive and not negative. It is

not the freedom from foreign Raj, it is the freedom to be ourselves. Its essence is the capacity for continuous initiative on the part of the nation in its own affairs. It means shifting the foundations of a nation's life from force to that of will and reason. Independence in the sense of severance of British connection does not appeal to him. Independence in the sense of choice in the matter even of British connection would do for him. It is substance that he is striving for. If British connection is helpful to India's growth, and India desires it, it should be welcome. If it is harmful to India's growth and she does not desire it, then she ought to have the right to get rid of it. But the urge to get rid of the Britishers at all cost leaves him cold. It does not touch even the fringe of our problem. The freedom from the foreigner is not certainly our freedom in the sense we desire it. Our main concern is not to drive out the foreigner, but to convert him from a foe into a friend, from a master into an equal. But there is a place in his scheme for the foreigner who helps, not the foreigner who exploits. A campaign against the British, because they are not Indians, is to him unholy, irreligious, a denial of our common soul, a denial of our common humanity. "But assuming that Great Britain alters her attitude, as I know she will when India is strong, it will be religiously unlawful for us so insist on independence. For it will be vindictive and petulant. It would amount to a denial of God, for the refusal will then be based upon the assumption that the British people are not capable of response to the God in man. Such a position is untenable for both a believing Mussalman and a believing Hindu.

"India's greatest glory will consist not in regarding Englishmen as her implacable enemies, fit only to be turned out of India, at the first available opportunity, but in turning them into friends and partners in a new com-

monwealth of nations in the place of an Empire based upon exploitation of the weaker or undeveloped nations and races of the earth and therefore finally upon force.

"Let us see what Swaraj together with the British connection means. It means undoubtedly India's ability to declare her independence, if she wishes. It will be a declaration of India's full self-expression. The British Parliament when the settlement comes, will ratify the wishes of the people of India as expressed not through the bureaucracy but through her freely chosen representatives."[1]

There is a touch of bravado, of bluff about the cry of independence. There is further a latent fear and suspicion of the foreigner, because he is a foreigner. There is greater regard for the name and the form of Swaraj, than for its reality. There is a disposition to fix beforehand the nature of the national demand, which ought to be rather left to the politicians to decide at the time when the country is ripe for it. There is a cry for isolation in the cry for independence. "Let us, therefore, understand what we mean by independence.... The fact of the matter is that we do not want our distant goal. It will be determined not by our definitions but by our acts, voluntary and involuntary...I submit that Swaraj is an all-satisfying goal for all time...It is infinitely greater than and includes independence."[2]

Independence is a negative concept: Swaraj is a positive word. The whole urge of India is to express herself both in her own affairs and in the affairs of the world, in a way which is characteristic of her great culture. Swaraj is the capacity of India to revive once more her ancient culture in a way suited to the needs of to-day. It is a cultural rather than political or economic ideal. It is a cry against a mechanical revival of our ancient traditions

or an equally mechanical imitation of the Western institutions. His protest against English rule is virtually and largely a protest against English culture. The Liberals deprecated economic domination most: the political Nationalists deprecated political domination most: Gandhi, like the cultural nationalists, hated cultural domination most. Gandhi welcomes freely the active and vigorous assimilation of all that is good and all that is suitable to our needs in the Western civilisation: what he resents is the wholesale imposition of the standards of one culture upon another culture. " What is resented is the sacrifice of Indian or Eastern culture at the altar of the Western...Of myself, whilst I have freely acknowledged my debt to Western culture, I can say that whatever service I have been able to render to the nation has been due entirely to the retention by me of Eastern culture to the extent it has been possible. I should have been thoroughly useless to the masses as an Anglicised and denationalised being, knowing little of, caring less for, and perhaps even despising their ways, habits, thoughts, and aspirations. It is difficult to estimate the loss of energy, caused to the nation by her children being obliged to resist the encroachments of a culture, which however good in itself, was unsuited for them, whilst they had not imbibed and become rooted in their own. "[1]

The fundamental motive of fight for Swaraj is thus to discover the soul of India. The fight against Great Britain is the fight against numberless ways in which a foreign culture was subtly weaving its nets round the Indian soul. The marks of the cultural domination of England are writ large on our life. The European has taken possession not only of our possessions, and our bodies, but our minds also. The process of disenchantment will have to be thorough. The Liberal Swaraj is a copy of the English Raj. The Nationalist Swaraj

is slightly different. The Gandhian Swaraj is much different. If India is content to be a copy of Britain, then the Liberals are right. What we then want is more and more of this culture; India then will become Englishstan. Gandhi agrees with the Nationalist that indegenous rule of the Marathas and Moghuls was better than the rule of the English. "I must dare to say that the Moghuls and the Maratha Government were better than the British, in that the nation as a whole was not so emasculate or so impoverished as it is to-day. We were not the Pariahs of the Moghul or the Maratha Empire. We are Pariahs of the British Empire."[1] But to-day our whole culture is in danger of eventual disappearance from the world. Foreign conquerors come and go: they merely affect the surface of our life. The cultural conquest is far more serious. We may then survive, but as annexes of the West. We then become real Pariahs, content with the crumbs of Western culture left to us. "The logical outcome of the Government policy is to Europeanise India and immediately we have become Europeanised, our English masters will gladly hand over the reins of Government to us. We would be welcome as their willing agents. I can have no interest in that deadly process save to put the whole of my humble weight against it. My Swaraj is to keep intact the genius of our civilization. I want to write many things but they must be all written on the Indian slate. I would gladly borrow from the West when I can return the amount with decent interest."[2]

No nation lives to itself alone. Every nation ought to live for humanity. National egoism has justification only in so far as a nation becomes the vehicle for the realisation of God. The enrichment of the life of humanity is what every nation ought to live for. Independence is, therefore, a means, not an end in itself. Gandhi wants

India to realise her great destiny of spiritualising the world. Swaraj means to him the conquest first of India and then of the whole world by truth and non-violence. It is, therefore, not the Swaraj attained by imitation of Parliamentary methods and institutions: it is not Swaraj attained through bloodshed. Such a Swaraj, as he has set his heart on, is to be achieved not by verbal agitation, nor by ousting the British. It is to be achieved by self-sacrifice and the realisation of internal spiritual unity of all the races and communities of India. Its great *raison d' etre* is, that through it India will attain consciousness of her highest self, and will be able to deliver once more the great message of the Upanishads to a war-distracted, might-ridden world of to-day. "My ambition is much higher than independence. Through the deliverance of India, I seek to deliver the so-called weaker races of the earth, from the crushing heels of Western exploitation in which England is the greatest partner. If India converts, as it can convert, Englishmen, it can become the predominant partner in a world-commonwealth of which England can have the privilege of becoming a partner if she chooses. India has the right, if she only knew, of becoming the predominant partner by reason of her numbers, geographical position, and culture inherited for ages. This is big talk I know. For a fallen India to aspire to move the world and protect weaker races is seemingly an impertinence. But in explaining this strong opposition to this cry for independence, I can no longer hide the light under a bushel. Mine is an ambition worth living for and worth dying for. In no case do I want to reconcile myself to a state lower that the best for fear of consequences. It is, therefore, not out of expediency that I oppose independence as my goal. I want India to come to her own and that State cannot be better defined by any single word than Swaraj. Its content will vary with the action that the nation is able to put forth at a given moment."[1]

The Swaraj for which Gandhi is fighting is not only the expression of the cultural need of India to be herself. It is also the expression of the economic need of the millions of India to live and live decently. Swaraj must be interpreted in terms of the welfare of the masses. In Gandhi, Indian culture to some extent ceases to be aristocratic and tries to be democratic. The message of Hinduism, the message of truth and non-violence, are not to be the monopoly of the few: they are to be the common property of all. The fundamental truths of Hinduism are often better preserved in the house of the Pariahs and the poorest classes than in the houses of the higher classes. Gandhi is not out to revive Brahmanism of the wrong type: he wants the light of culture to spread among all. He is opposed to a violent movement for the attainment of Swaraj, because the masses will be shut out from it. He is not very much reconciled to a peaceful transfer of power from the British to the higher classes in India, in the way in which Liberals contemplate it, because the masses will be shut out from it too. His sole objective is the life he wants to put into the millions and millions of his countrymen. The village is the unit round which his Swaraj turns. The weaver, the peasant, and the scavenger form the vanguard of his army. He does not want to use the masses with a view to wrest power from the British: he wants to use the classes with a view to stiffen the back of the masses. This is the meaning of the Khadi programme. "There is no organic Swaraj until the starving millions feel its glow. They will not feel it until the living contact is established between them and us, the vocal class who bitterly bleed them in order that we may live."[1]

The Liberal movement on the whole represented the classes: the Nationalist movement roused the masses to some extent, by dramatic appeals: but the Gandhian move-

ment intends to work out the whole constructive programme through the masses and thus enlist their whole-hearted support in the struggle. Gandhi, therefore, often prefers the slow politics of ceaseless internal transformation through constructive work, designed to bring the masses and classes together, to the swift dramatic politics of storming Government citadels. There can be no effective external political pressure without the work of internal development. "The politicians who put the external work before the internal, or who think (which is the same thing) that the internal is too slow for them, should have the greatest freedom to develop their strength, but in my opinion, this should be outside the Congress platform. The Congress must progressively represent the masses. They are as yet untouched by politics. They have no political consciousness of the type our politicians desire... Their politics are confined to bread and salt...It is right, however, to say that we the politicians do represent the masses in opposition to Government. But if we begin to use them before they are ready we shall cease to represent them. We must first come in living touch with them by working for them and in their midst. We must share their sorrows, understand their difficulties, and anticipate their wants. With the Pariah we must be Pariahs and see how we feel to clean the closets of the upper classes and have the remains of their table thrown at us. We must see how we like being in the boxes, miscalled houses, of the labourers of Bombay. We must identify ourselves with the villagers, who toil under the hot sun beating on their bent backs and see how we will like to drink water from the pool, in which the villagers bathe, wash their clothes and pots and in which their cattle drink and roll. Then, and not till then, shall we truly represent the masses and they will, as surely as I am writing this, respond to every call."[1]

The Swaraj means to Gandhi virtually the creation of a rural civilisation, characterised by simplicity, cleanliness, health, plain living and noble thinking. If and so far as the capitalists, the landlords, and the intellectuals help us to evolve the new village they are all welcome. Swaraj means the humming of a new life through all the villages. The villagers must be freed from one thousand and one handicaps, from the tyranny of the Government officers, landlords, middlemen, moneylenders, from the clutches of ignorance and superstition, want and squalor, hunger and dirt, and should be enabled to look the whole world in its face, and to worship their God in this arcadian atmosphere of the new village. The rest of India has so far lived a parasitical existence upon the villages. The unhealthy civilisation of the cities has grown on the labour of the villagers. It is time that we reverse the process. The villagers have lived for us so long. We must live for them now. No scheme of Swaraj is worth even the paper on which it is written, unless it means this renaissance of rural India. "If the right type of workers go to these villages with the message of the wheel and with a patience that will not be exhausted and a faith that will not be removed, not one of the villagers need leave their homes. For it is not merely the wages earned by the spinners that are to be counted, but it is the whole reconstruction that follows in the wake of the spinning wheel. The village weaver, the village dyer, the village washerman, the village blacksmith, the village carpenter, all and many others, will then find themselves reinstated in their ancient dignity."[1]

Swaraj, therefore, means elimination of parasitism in our life in every shape and form. The root of all social, political, and economic evil is the spirit of exploitation, which enables a privileged few to feed upon the unprivileged many. The greatest sinner in this connec-

tion is the British Raj in India. Its basis is that of greed. Its roots are economic. Gandhi fights the Raj not only because it represents the invasion of a foreign culture, but also because it represents the invasion of Imperialism. India is being bled for the last hundred years and more. Gandhi accepts the Liberal theory that commercial drain is at the root of Indian poverty. "There is no doubt that foreign exploitation of India is a cause of poverty...This exploitation is a hydra-headed monster, taking a variety of shapes to suit given occasions. The marine, the military, the currency, the railway and the revenue policy of the foreign Government is directed deliberately to promote an exploitation such as the world has never before witnessed. Poverty of India will never be removed so long as the exploitation continues unabated."[1]

Gandhi's revolt against the Empire was due to the conviction that gradually dawned upon him that the Empire stood for a policy of all-round exploitation of India in the interests of Great Britain. The so-called agencies of civilisation which it has planted in our midst, like the railways, are meant to further this object of exploitation. The peace which England has given to India is the peace of death, not of life. "I long for freedom from the English yoke. I would accept chaos in exchange for it. For the English peace is the peace of the grave. Anything would be better than this living death of a whole people. This satanic rule has well-nigh ruined this fair land materially, morally, and spiritually. I daily see its law courts denying justice and murdering truth...The unparalleled extravagance of this rule has demented the Rajas and the Maharajas, who, unmindful of consequences ape it and grind their subjects to dust. In order to protect its immoral commerce, this rule regards no means too mean and in order to keep three hundred millions under the heels of a hundred thousand, it carries a military

expenditure which is keeping millions in a state of semi-starvation and polluting thousands of mouths with intoxicating liquor."[1]

The Empire is based not on a partnership between two equal peoples: it is based on the sub-ordination of Indians to Englishmen. It implies the English superiority and Indian inferiority. Englishmen think themselves born to rule. Indians are born to obey. This cult makes for the gradual degradation of Indian character. It makes Indians lose consciousness of their inner worth and think that the position they have come to occupy is their normal position. "My whole soul has risen against the existing system of Government, because I feel that there is no real freedom for India under the British connection, if Englishmen cannot give up the fetish of their predestined superiority. This attitude of Englishmen has deprived the tallest Indian of any chance of rising to his full height, and therefore, in spite of all the good intentions of individual English administrators, we have really lost in our own estimation, so much so that many of us have come to believe that we require a long course of training under the English, whereas it is my conviction that we are to-day quite fit to govern ourselves."[2]

Gandhi considers the connection between India and England to-day to be wholly artificial, unnatural. No nation has a right to govern another nation. The connection is built of force and fraud. There cannot be voluntary co-operation on the part of India, because such a co-operation exists between two equals. The whole institution, therefore, should be placed on a different basis. To-day the Empire consolidates its position partly by enlisting our co-operation, partly by dividing and weakening us. "To me every institution, be it the most philanthropic, run by and in the name of the Empire in India,

has an unmistakable taint about it. That we run to and hug most or some of them, is no test of their goodness. It is the test of our helplessness, short-sightedness, or selfishness. We have not the courage to sacrifice much in order to save ourselves from criminal participation in sustaining an Empire, which is based on fraud and force, and whose chief, if not one, aim is to perpetuate the policy of ever-growing exploitation of the so-called weaker races of the earth."[1] India must, therefore, try her best to break the yoke of this Empire, not merely because the Empire comes in the way of her peaceful development, but also because it uses her as a tool for the conquest of other countries. "The greatest menace to the world to-day is the growing, exploiting, irresponsible Imperialism, which through the enslavement of India, is threatening the independent existence and expansion of the weaker races of the world. That Imperialism is a negation of God. It does ungodly acts in the name of God. It covers its inhumanities, Dyerisms and O'Dwyerisms, under cover of humanity, justice, and righteousness."[2]

Gandhi, however, is no enemy of the English people. His attitude to the English is one of utter friendship and respect. The English people are a great people. Most of them do not know or realise, what is being done in their name. "I have respect for Englishmen, because I recognise their bravery, their spirit of sacrifice for what they believe to be good for themselves, their cohesion, and their powers of vast organisation."[1] It is the system that is vicious. Here also it is necessary to discriminate. It is one thing to demand severance of the British connection; it is quite a different thing to try to transform its character. The fear of the English must go. The greed for English fineries must go. It is then only that the connection will be perfectly natural. A partnership of equal peoples, freely and voluntarily working together

will be better than a violent separation of the two. "I hold that such severance is not indispensable for India's growth and freedom. The burden of severance should lie with the English people. It is more dignified for us to declare our readiness to be partners on equal terms and at will, with the English, in a Federation of Free States... Isolated independence is not the goal of the world States. It is voluntary inter-dependence. England is by no means so independent as to absorb any European State she chooses. Her independence depends partly upon the good-will of her neighbours and partly upon her armaments. In so far as she relies upon her armament, she is a menace to the world, as in fact she became during the late war. She stood, as we now learn, not for righteousness but for plunder."[1] Gandhi feels that the doctrine of the sovereignty of the States, is to-day blocking the path of the world towards the realisation of the ideals of peace, co-operation, and brotherhood in the world. The British Empire, therefore, should cease to be a domination of coloured people by white people: it should transform itself into a commonwealth of free and equal nations, each realising its own highest good in the company of the rest. It can only then be a small League of Nations, showing the path to a World State, a political and economic Union of humanity.

The liberal demand for reforms, for Swaraj by instalments, for greater and greater Indianisation does not move Gandhi. Change of heart, change of spirit is what he most earnestly pleads for. A co-operation with the administration only means partnership in the exploitation of poor Indian humanity. A slow, constitutional evolution by stages will never lead to Swaraj. There is impatience in Gandhi with the British rule, because he feels that it leads us into deeper and deeper mire of servitude. "I regard the reforms and everything else in the

nature of opiates to deaden our conscience. We must refuse to wait for generations, to furnish us with a patient solution of a problem, which is ever-growing in seriousness. Nature knows no mercy in dealing stern justice. If we do not wake up before long, we shall be wiped out of existence."[1] "Let us not mistake reformed councils, more law-courts and even governorship, for real freedom or powers. They are but subtler methods of emasculation."[2]

The evil of British rule is not merely that it is based on brute force, but rather to a great extent on the sinister method of enlisting our co-operation and weakening the solidarity of the nation by a policy of 'divide and rule.' "The division policy need not be always conscious and deliberate. Mussalmans against Hindus, Non-Brahmins against Brahmins, Sikhs against both, Gurkhas against all the three, this game of permutation and combination has gone on ever since the advent of British rule and will continue, so long as the Government considers its interests to be antagonistic to those of the people, or its existence to be against the desire of the people. Hence it is that Swaraj is a vital necessity for national growth."[3]

The trump card in the hands of the opponents of Swaraj is India's weakness for external defence and internal peace. Gandhi feels that it is preferable to fight it out among ourselves, to accepting peace imposed by the British bayonet. Capacity for resisting foreign aggression we certainly do not possess: but here too we are dealing with abstractions not realities. If India is able to oust the British, she will be able in virtue of that very strength to make herself secure against other foreign invaders. The essence of the right for Swaraj consists in our getting rid of the sense of helplessness, that is coming over us. The moment we shed the fear of death, we get Swaraj. "Swaraj means a state such that we can maintain our separate existence without the presence of the English...

For me the only training in Swaraj we need, is the ability to defend ourselves against the whole world and to live our natural life in perfect freedom, even though it may be full of defects. Good government is no substitute for self-government. The Afghans have a bad Government, but it is self-government. I envy them. The Japanese learnt the art through a sea of blood. And if we to-day had the power to drive out the English by superior brute force, we would be counted their superiors and in spite of our inexperience in debating at the Council table or in holding executive offices, we would be held fit to govern ourselves. For brute force is the only test the West has hitherto recognised. The Germans were defeated not because they were necessarily in the wrong, but because the allied powers were found to possess greater brutal strength. In the end, therefore, India must either learn the art of war which the British will not teach her, or she must follow her own way of discipline and self-sacrifice through Non-co-operation."[1]

India has a difficult problem to face. The argument of military helplessness of India is unanswerable. But Britain creates that helplessness and then makes it a plea to continue in India for an indefinitely long time. The one way out is to petition England and trust her to do the needful in good time. That is the Liberal method. Or, it may be that Great Britain for her own interest, will be forced to enlist the support of Indians, in order to fight effectively foreign combinations. This is the most likely thing to happen. The Liberals also believe in it. Some day Britain will be forced to make her choice: either fight without the real co-operation of India and take the chance of being beaten, or to enlist the support of Indians and to share the domination of India with the Indians. This is the most realistic position. In the meantime, it is upto India to prepare herself, as far

as possible. The way of violence is not really open to her. Even if it were, Gandhi is not the man to prepare her for it. His whole philosophy of life is different. He would fight violence by non-violence. This is the only course open to Gandhi. If India masters the lesson of non-violence of the most active type, non-violence not of the cowards, but of the bravest, she may solve this apparently insoluble problem once for all.

It is perfectly true that it is hard, with our present state of mind, to live in an open world, without being terrified by the prospect of eventual disruption from within and invasion from without. But Gandhi would not recommend to us the alternative of strengthening the British Raj, with a view to increase our security. That is the greatest evil. He would prefer anarchy, civil war, foreign conquests by others, to the present state of affairs. A state of passivity, of fear, of helplessness has come over us. There is an atmosphere of violence all round us. There is the domination of brute force. If we are afraid of the Afghan bogey, we will have to hug closer to our bosom the British masters. But what do they represent? They represent continuous organised violence, moral and physical. It is a choice between evils. Here is the root incapacity of India. Gandhi thinks that the only way to rise superior to this atmosphere, is to cast off mean, grovelling fear of losing our lives and our possessions, every moment of our life. "I cannot imagine a greater humiliation for the self-respecting man than to be dependent, for the safety of himself or of his family, on those who, he thinks, prey upon him. I would prefer total destruction of myself and my all to purchasing safety at the cost of my manhood. This feeling of helplessness in us has really arisen from our deliberate dismissal of God from our common affairs. We have become atheists for all practical purposes. And, therefore, we believe that in the

long run we must rely upon physical force for our protection. In the face of physical danger, we cast all our philosophy to the winds. Our daily life is a negation of God. If, then, we would but have a little trust in God i. e. ourselves, we shall find no difficulty with the tribesmen. Only in that case, we will have to be prepared at times to surrender our possessions and under certain circumstances our lives rather than our honour. We must refuse to believe that our neighbours are savages incapable of responding to the finer instincts in man.

"Thus consistently with our self-respect, there are but two courses open to us, to prepare in so far as we wish to defend ourselves, however weakly, against robbery and plunder, or to believe in the capacity of our neighbours, to respond to the nobler instinct in man and to endeavour to reform the tribesmen. I apprehend that the two processes will go hand in hand. We must avoid the third at any cost, that is, reliance on the British bullet to protect us from harm. It is the surest way to national suicide."[1]

Gandhi aims at realising a partnership between Great Britain and India on terms of perfect equality. What does it imply ? There should be a completely responsible government both in the provinces and at the centre. National control should be complete and effective even over defence and external affairs. "Defence and its Army is to a nation the very essence of existence, and if a Nation's defence is controlled by an outside agency, no matter how friendly it is, that nation certainly is not responsibly governed."[2]

In this self-governing India, there will be no racial discrimination. The only discrimination, Gandhi will allow, will be in favour of the poor. The economics of free India will be different from the economics

of India to-day. Gandhi suggested two formulæ in the Round Table Conference. "No disqualification no suffered by Indian born citizens of the State, shall be imposed upon any persons, lawfully residing in or entering India, merely on the ground of race, colour or religion."[1] "No existing interest, legitimately acquired, and not being in conflict with the best interest of the nation in general, shall be interfered with except in accordance with the law applicable to such interests."[2]

Free India will be free to little purpose, if she cannot control, regulate, and develop national industry and trade, in the interests of India. Gandhi, on the whole, accepts the Liberal view that India should have the right to impose tariffs, if necessary, on selected foreign imports or to grant subsidies to indigenous enterprise. Many foreign vested interests have grown up by concessions, privileges, and favours which stand in the way of legitimate national enterprise. It may be, therefore, necessary to protect infant industries or coastal trade by necessary regulation.

Free India, therefore, is nationalised India. All interests, internal or external, will have to bow down to the national idea. All the privileged classes may be required to bow down their necks to national interests. A new democratic State is in the process of being born. It is to be a democracy not of the bourgeois type, a custodian of the vested interests of Indian capitalists, Indian landlords, Indian Princes. It is to be a democracy in which the worker, the farmer, the untouchable will be called upon to determine the fate of India. Such a democracy is to be raised on the basis of adult franchise. There is an invitation in it to the Europeans, to the Indian Civil Service, to the Princes, to the Zemindars, to the Capitalists, to co-operate. The service of the nation is the fundamental ideal of the new social order of Gandhi.

The service of God and humanity through the service of the nation, on the basis of truth and non-violence, is the slogan. To all the vested interests, Gandhi addresses the same words which he addressed to the Princes. "If the States persist in their obstinacy and hug their ignorance of the awakening that has taken place throughout India, they are courting certain destruction. I claim to be a friend of States...All the States may not live. The biggest ones can live only if they will recognise their limitations, become servants of their people, trustees of their welfare, and depend for their existence, not on arms, whether their own or British, but solely on the good-will of their people."[1]

13. THE METHOD OF POLITICAL CHANGE: THE CREED OF NON-VIOLENCE.

Gandhi's greatest contribution to the thought of the world, as well as to the thought of India, lies in the unique technique he has evolved to solve the major problems of society. Hitherto, the politicians in India had mainly recourse to the liberal method of intellectual persuasion to be brought about by intellectual instruments or the nationalist method of invoking the mass mind by a play on their national consciousness. It was reserved for Gandhi to combine these methods with considerable refinements, borrowed both from the Western as well as Eastern thinkers of the past. This new method is known as the method of Passive Resistance, Satyagraha, Non-violence, or Civil Disobedience.

But the method may be best known as Satyagraha. The term was coined by Gandhi, in order to distinguish his movement from the movement of Passive Resistance. Passive Resistance is a weapon of the weak; Satyagraha is a weapon of the strong. Passive Resistance does not

exclude the use of physical force altogether: Satyagraha excludes its use in any shape or form. Passive Resistance is a method employed for a specific purpose; while Satyagraha stands for an eternal principle.

Satyagraha stands, in fact, for truth, for love, for non-violence. It is the law of life, the law which we are all employing, consciously or unconsciously, every day of our life. In this way, it operates almost like the law of gravitation, because it is as universal, as irresistible as the law of gravitation. Without the law of gravitation, the physical universe would come to a dead stop or run into chaos; without the law of love, the organic universe would meet with a similar fate. If, then, the law of love is the supreme principle, dominating all life, the more we understand its working and the more we accommodate ourselves to it, the more one we shall be with all life. It can give the mystical peace of mind, which passeth all understanding: because like the knowledge of the supreme Brahman it removes all misunderstandings, clears all doubts, unties all knots, and fills the mind with ecstatic delight. "The more I work at this law, the more I feel the delight in life, the delight in the scheme of this universe. It gives me a peace and a meaning of the mysteries of nature that I have no power to describe."[1] But it is more. It is not merely an individualistic principle, capable of solving all personal, intellectual or spiritual problems: it is the greatest social principle capable of solving all problems of corporate life. "My daily experience, as of those who are working with me, is that every problem would lend itself to solution if we are determined to make the law of truth and non-violence the law of life."[2]

Satyagraha means truth-force. But what is truth? It is supposed that every one has not the capacity to determine truth for himself and, therefore, has not the

right to do so. But as the Indian Social Reformer says: "The question, in our opinion, betrays a strange ignorance of what truth is. The best credential of truth is that it can be apprehended by all."[1] If you deny the capacity of each man to determine truth for himself, you deny all human progress. Thousands of Indians in South Africa did not require any great intellectual or moral equipment to see truth for themselves.

In the pursuit of truth, however, non-violence is an essential part. In the absence of non-violence, different people may not only arrive at different conclusions, as regards truth in particular circumstances, but also try to enforce it by violence. The result will be chaos or arbitrary imposition of truth by some on others. Gandhi does not seem to favour the fascist method of bringing about a state of uniformity by the meek submission, willing or unwilling, by the masses to the truth as the national leaders see it. He evidently prefers the liberal method of argument and persuasion, in order to bring about common agreement. But he tries to distinguish himself from the Liberals by bringing in the most powerful argument of voluntary suffering. It means that if you convince yourself that truth is on your side, and you mean that truth to prevail, you should not try to inflict suffering on others, but invite suffering yourself. "In the application of Satyagraha, I discovered in the earliest stages, that pursuit of truth did not admit of violence being inflicted on one's opponent: but that he must be weaned from error by patience and sympathy. For what appears to be truth to one may appear to be error to another. And patience means self-suffering. So the doctrine came to mean vindication of truth not by infliction of suffering on the opponent, but on one's self."[2]

Non-violence is central in Gandhi's theory. The

call to the pursuit of truth is not a new thing in the history of humanity. It has been always an inspiration to saints, to philosophers, and to scientists. But the call to the pursuit of truth in politics and in sociology appears to be certainly a bit startling and new. Gandhi's whole originality lies in trying to make truth fundamental not in abstract science, nor in sublime metaphysics: but in the essentially worldly affairs of men, in the relations between groups and groups, between States and States, and between Governments and their subjects. He is hitching our waggon to the stars. He is trying to infuse the spirit of eternity into the everyday life of man. Satyagraha is not a new thing, but Satyagraha in politics is new.

It appears that Gandhi is perfectly logical in all this. If truth is the law of our being, if truth is the highest value in religion and metaphysics, there is no reason why men should build their social life on any other foundation. The gospel of expediency must, therefore, give way to the gospel of truth. If a lie is despicable as regards the relations between men and men, how can it be honourable as regards the relations between nations and nations ? We should not cut life into compartments. We should not say one set of values should be held sacred in public life and another set of values should prevail in private life. Gandhi's theory is a protest against this double-mindedness in us. Murder is murder whether it is practised by an individual or a group. Fraud is fraud, whether it takes the name of diplomacy, or of high finance, or of high politics.

Gandhi holds a brief for the prevalence of 'one weight and one measure' everywhere. It is as clear as daylight to him that truth will prevail against the heaviest odds. It has never been given a sufficient trial. To

Gandhi, however, it is axiomatic that truth is bound to win. "For me non-violence is not a mere philosophical principle. It is a matter not of the intellect but of the heart... I am painfully aware of my failings. But the Light within me is steady and clear. There is no escape for any of us save through truth and non-violence."[1]

Let us go back to the essential conditions of our own existence, the essential nature of ourselves as human beings. Gandhi's message that truth should be the basis of our social life is not the message of a visionary. It is the message of a practical man, of a practical idealist. It is the call to be ourselves. We have forgotten ourselves. We believe that the law of the jungle is the proper law in international affairs. We believe that chicanery and fraud, war and destruction are inevitable. But Gandhi asks us in all sobriety whether in all this, we are not victims of hallucinations. In the kingdom of inanimate being, nature often is "red in tooth and claw." It is also so in the kingdom of brutes. But are we not really different from brutes ? Gandhi bases his whole case on that. The religion of non-violence is not meant merely for the Rishis and saints. It is meant for the common people as well. Non-violence is the law of our species, as violence is the law of the brute. The spirit lies in the brute and he knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law, to the strength of the spirit."[2]

Non-violence to Gandhi means now truth-force, now love-force, and now soul-force. Only these words must be properly understood. They represent different aspects of the same principle. Truth is the one end and aim of our being : but how is truth to be made effective among men ? It is through love. There is no more powerful agency to convert people's souls than love. Here is a striking difference between Gandhism and the usual

type of Liberalism. Gandhi addresses himself more to the heart than to the intellect. The conversion of men to be effective should be by soul-force not by brute-force, by the appeal to men's hearts, rather than to their heads, by an appeal to their instinct of love, rather than to their instinct of fear. Non-violence, therefore, means the substitution of the law of love for the law of force.

Here is a new method of change advocated by Gandhi. It is nothing new to say that we must all take our stand on truth. The fighter for the cause of truth as well as his opponent swears by the nature of truth. The whole novelty of Gandhi's philosophy lies in his advocacy of a new instrument, a new technique for the introduction of change in society. If men are completely intellectual, and only intellectual, if problems in politics are just like problems in physics or mathematics, the method of sweet persuasion, so popular with the Liberals would be sufficient. But men form themselves in groups: and these groups dominate the individuals. Hence, what is true with regard to single individuals is not always true with regard to groups called castes, races, or nations. A new psychology called 'group psychology' takes the place of the individual psychology. Secondly, men are not mere logical machines but bundles of interests and habits. It is, therefore, clear that the tame method advocated by men like Gokhale often proves hopelessly ineffective. What then is the alternative? The Nationalists of the Tilak school mobilised the mass mind by an appeal to their nationalism: but how was this newly aroused national consciousness to express itself so that it may be effective in bringing about a new heaven and earth in Indian political field? The terrorists advocated the method of secret violence as under the circumstances most effective. It is here that Gandhi steps in and utters a warning against a thoughtless and heartless flirtation with the

forces of darkness, in the name not merely of political ineffectiveness, but of moral and spiritual bankruptcy. It was a dramatic moment in the history of recent Indian politics. The school of petitioning had lost its hold over the popular mind : the school of violence was not yet born, but it was struggling to be born. The Indian political horizon was overshadowed by clouds : but there was a silver lining in the appearance of a new prophet with a new message. Must India go back to the political lethargy of the past and give way to completest political despair ? Or must she borrow weapons from the anarchical school of the West in order to make the Indian world unsafe for English bureaucracy ?

Gandhi's answer is his creed of non-violence. Though the word is negative, the idea is very positive. It is not the mere negation of violence. Political philosophers as well as practical politicians will both ask Gandhi as to the exact place of violence in his scheme of things. The doctrine of the complete elimination of force from human affairs has earned the name of anarchism in the West. If non-violence means mere absence of violence, absence of force and, therefore, under certain circumstances, meek acceptance of evil and tyranny, it would be another word for cowardice. Such non-violence is only too much in evidence in India. It has almost become a part of the nature of vast sections of Indian population. Gandhi's non-violence should never be confounded with this negation of violence born out of weakness and cowardice. Gandhi preaches a resort to arms, a use of force in cases of such helplessness. A bold stand in defence of honour or property, even if it takes the form of violence, is infinitely superior to running away from danger or quiet acceptance of the wrong. Gandhi preaches a doctrine of manliness, not a gospel of passivity. " When there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I

would advise violence. Thus, when my eldest son asked me what he should have done, had he been present when I was almost fatally assaulted in 1908, whether he should have run away and seen me killed or whether he should have used his physical force which he could and wanted to use, and defended me. I told him that it was his duty to defend me even by using violence. Hence it was that I took part in the Boer War, the so-called Zulu Rebellion and the late war. Hence also I advocate training in arms for those who believe in the methods of violence. I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour."[1]

People are puzzled by Gandhi's attitude in the Boer War or the Great War. It is necessary here to remember that while Gandhi's non-violence is higher than violence, violence in many cases is better than the usual type of non-violence. To make this clear, let us refer more fully to the occasions when Gandhi preached or practised violence. Gandhi once ordered monkeys in his Ashram to be killed. Here is his justification. "I am a member of an institution which holds a few acres of land, whose crops are in imminent peril from monkeys. I believe in the sacredness of all life and hence I regard it as a breach of Ahimsa to inflict any injury on monkeys. But I do not hesitate to instigate and direct an attack on the monkeys, in order to save the crops. I would like to avoid this evil. I can avoid it by leaving or breaking up the institution. I do not do so because I do not expect to be able to find a society where there will be no agriculture and, therefore, no destruction of some life. In fear and trembling, in humility and penance, I, therefore, participate in the injury inflicted on monkeys, hoping some day to find a way out."[2] Gandhi's non-violence, therefore, is certainly different from mere abstention from physical

injury, mere use of physical force, mere avoidance of taking life.

Non-violence is an ideal. It is not always easy even for the highest among us to practise this ideal. From the standpoint of this ideal, all war, and all participation in a war, stands condemned. It is no use fastening the blame of destruction on soldiers. The whole organisation behind the soldiers is really responsible for war-guilt. Those who help the war directly or indirectly are all equal sharers of the guilt. What, then, is the position of a conscientious objector ? Gandhi's answer is very characteristic. His duty is to help the Government in all possible ways, unless he pits himself against such a Government, body and soul. One cannot have it both ways. One should not take advantage of a Governmental organisation in times of peace and desert it in the time of war. "So long as I lived under a system of Government based on force and voluntarily partook of the many facilities and privileges it created for me, I was bound to help that Government to the extent of my ability when it was engaged in a war, unless I non-co-operated with that Government and renounced to the utmost of my capacity the privileges it offered me."[1]

It is justifiable for a State to go to war for purposes of national defence. It is justifiable for the citizens of the State to help the State in times of war, whether by direct participation in the war or in other ways. It is justifiable even for a citizen who does not believe in war, who even pledges himself to the ideal of non-violence, to co-operate with the State at the time of war. But when ? As long as the citizens accept the Government and all that it implies; as long as the citizens of the State generally do not believe in non-violence. Non-violence cannot be brought about by violence.

A literal acceptance of the ideal of non-violence may do more harm than good. The situations which confront us in life are often very complex, as life itself is very complex. Mere lip-worship of a great principle like non-violence, or a fanatical adherence to it will carry us nowhere. Gandhi is very conscious of this. It is, therefore, that he advocates the killing of monkeys in the interests of agriculture, the participation in a war, in the interests of an orderly maintenance of society, the military training of citizens in the interests of a people who are not yet won over to non-violence, and the necessary use of force for the sake of honour or principle, rather than a meek acquiescence in evil. "Life is governed by a multitude of forces. It would be smooth-sailing, if one could determine the course of one's actions only by one general principle, whose application at a given moment was too obvious to need even a moment's reflection. But I cannot recall a single act which could be so easily determined."[1] Again, "Non-violence works in the most mysterious manner. Often a man's actions defy analysis in terms of non-violence: equally often his actions may wear the appearance of violence when he is absolutely non-violent in the highest sense of the term and is subsequently found to be so. All I can then claim for my conduct is that it was, in the instance cited, actuated in the interests of non-violence."[2]

Non-violence of Gandhi, in fact, is a deduction from his metaphysics. This comes out clearly when he translates non-violence by soul-force. The whole case for non-violence rests upon the proper analysis of man. If we adopt a materialistic interpretation of the universe, war is defensible. Even if we rise to a biological view of man, a physical struggle between living organisms is understandable in the interests of group-life, in the interests of efficiency of the race and survival of the fittest. But the Hindu philosophy, which Gandhi has

inherited, is absolutely clear on the point. Man is essentially neither a group of atoms or electrons, nor a centre of life, nor a rational being: he is essentially a soul. The spiritual life is the deepest principle in man and in nature and is, therefore, bound to triumph over the other more superficial aspects of his nature. The old story of the fight between Vishwamitra and Vashishtha leaves no doubt in a Hindu's mind about the Hindu view. In the conflict between the Brahma-bala and the Kshatriya-bala, the Brahma-bala is bound to prevail. The greatest military might always bows down to the spiritual power of the ascetics. "If the world believes in the existence of the soul, it must be recognised that soul force is better than bodily force: it is the sacred principle of love which moves mountains. On us lies the responsibility of living out this sacred law; we are not concerned with results."[1]

To Gandhi, therefore, the country's political salvation is more a means than an end. He does not care at all for Swaraj, if it is obtained by violence. This has been to him a source of many differences with his compatriots. But he is adamantine about it. The soul must be true to the law of its being. That is the highest Swaraj. What is political Swaraj compared with the spiritual Swaraj? Gandhi is primarily a saint or a philosopher and secondarily a politician. India to him means India's real culture and his entry into politics is actuated by his ardent desire to save it. For Gandhi, therefore, the question whether violence or non-violence is a more efficient method for attaining Swaraj simply does not arise. For him there is only one method, and he has not a shadow of doubt, that it will not only bring Swaraj, but solve all problems. "If India takes up the doctrine of the sword, she may gain momentary victory. Then India will cease to be the pride of my heart. I am wedded to her because

I owe my all to her. I believe absolutely that she has a mission for the world. She is not to copy Europe blindly. India's acceptance of the doctrine of the sword will be the hour of my trial. I hope I shall not be found wanting. My religion has no geographical limits. If I have a living faith in it, it will transcend my love for India herself. My life is dedicated to the service of India through the religion of non-violence which I believe to be the root of Hinduism."[1]

It is certainly difficult to convey an exact idea of non-violence by means of a logical definition. It is truth. It is love. It is soul-force. But can we define truth or love or soul-force ? Non-violence aims at the conquest of the world by means of truth or love or soul. There is no place in it for fraud or duplicity. Politics now no longer means a game of chess where cunning often wins. You have to trust your opponent as much as you trust yourself : and, consequently, it is your bounden duty not to play false with him, or to hit him below the belt. You have, therefore, to inform him of every important move you contemplate towards him. There is no secrecy here : everything is plain and above board. What a change in the whole atmosphere this has meant ? " It was because not very long ago we were afraid to speak or write that we thought that our sentiment burrowed under and became foul with stench, because of the absence of the fierce sun and the open air of public opinion playing upon them. Hence we had secret revolutionary movement. To-day, thank God, we seem to have outlived the evil day. We dare to think, speak, and write openly, without fear, but under restraint that openness imposes upon mankind."[2]

There is no place, secondly, in non-violence for anger or hatred or revenge. There is scope enough for an ethics of retribution at a lower plane in life. But the

moment we try to lift the whole process of living on a higher level, we realise the intrinsic absurdity of retaliation. It is easy enough to give a blow for a blow : but the more human and the more difficult thing is to control our anger and try to understand our enemy's point of view from within. The moment we realise that we are essentially spiritual beings, we become invulnerable to the attacks of the world, and we further become not only harmless but positive sources of higher life to all who come within the range of our influence. Here Gandhi is trying to call us back to old, eternal truths of all higher religions and wants us to love all, to hate none and to conquer evil not by evil, but by good. " When a person claims to be non-violent, he is expected not to be angry with one who has injured him. He will not wish him harm, he will wish him well; he will not swear at him; he will not cause him any physical hurt. He will put up with all the injury to which he is subjected by the wrong-doer. Thus non-violence is complete innocence; complete non-violence is complete absence of ill-will against all that lives. It, therefore, embraces even sub-human life, not excluding noxious insects or beasts. They have not been created to feed our destructive propensities. If we only knew the mind of the Creator, we should find their proper place in His creation. Non-violence is, therefore, in its active form, good-will towards all life ; it is pure love. I have read it in the Hindu Scriptures, in the Bible, and in the Koran."[1]

It is impossible to appreciate the full meaning of non-violence without picturing it as a positive force making for righteousness and harmony in the world. Non-violence is the very opposite of passivity. It is not born of *tamas*, (the principle of inertia) but of *sattwa* (the principle of goodness) in us. The non-violence which India practised in political matters before Gandhi's advent

was perhaps largely born out of passivity: but the non-violence of Gandhi is made of different stuff. It is a more dynamic force than any we know of. "Truth and non-violence are perhaps the activest forces you have in the world. A man who wields sanguinary weapons and is intent upon destroying those whom he considers his enemies, does at least require some rest and has to lay down his arms for a while in every twenty-four hours. He is, therefore, essentially inactive for certain part of the day. Not so the votary of truth and non-violence, for the simple reason that they are not external weapons. They reside in the human breast and they are actively working their way whether you are awake or whether you are asleep: whether you are walking leisurely or playing an active game. The panoplied warrior of truth and non-violence is ever and incessantly active."[1]

There is, therefore, more fight in the principles of truth and love than in any other principles. The slogan that "justice must be done though the heavens fall:" is one of the greatest slogans that humanity has heard. The passion for truth and the passion for justice touch the deepest springs of our real nature. They inspire all wider movements in history: they sustain all the major institutions of all societies. Love of ease, of comfort, of power, of pelf may retard them for a while either in individuals or in groups; but in the long run nothing can stop the march of humanity towards its great destiny, on the basis of these fundamental forces. Gandhi is here trying to release these greatest forces of history in India. India had gone mad again and again in the past for metaphysical truth, for the realisation of God in the private lives of individuals. Gandhi is now asking her to shift her emphasis a little and to stake her all not for the liberation of an individual from the artificial bonds of Maya, but for the liberation of society from the misleading

bonds of inertia and selfishness. The old technique which was considered so effective in religion is now to be made use of in the sphere of politics.

Gandhi has acquired terrible momentum in India because in him the ancient message of India once more speaks in its native language to the soul of India. India is nothing if not religious. She has always shown her extraordinary passion for the mystic goals of Dharma and Moksha. Often dull and insensible to the point of death to everything else, she has been always alive to the cry of faith. The great Western social objectives, like political independence, become effective in India only when they are couched in terms of her past faith. The intellectuals to-day in India may have been westernised to some extent: but the heart of that great body called the Indian masses cannot be touched adequately, by the cries of fiscal autonomy and political freedom. This secret of Indian psychology was clear to great men like Vivekananda: but it was reserved for Gandhi for the first time in recent Indian history to attempt to take not the kingdom of heaven but the kingdom of earth by storm, not by earthly weapons but by spiritual weapons. Here is tremendous audacity, first-class imagination, and most magnificent leadership. Gandhi thus breaks the old ruts and creates new paths not only for India, but possibly for humanity. A great message like this can most fittingly come from a country like India, which, in spite of the storm and stress through which she has passed for ages, has preserved her ancient faith still intact to some extent.

The Liberals had prepared the ground for the reception of important political truths by the Indian mind. The Tilakites had prepared the ground for the new unification of Indian masses under the influence of the new cry of nationalism. The religious revolutionaries had

prepared the Indian mind for new interpretations of India's past creed in terms of new ideals. The political revolutionaries were demanding a more drastic active programme, whether violent or otherwise. It was at this stage that Gandhi emerges, a man more from the masses than from the oligarchical castes, a man who talks in the language of the people than of the schools, a man who goes back to the primal truths of Indian religion and philosophy, in the spirit of saints and Bhaktas (devotees) like Kabir or Tukaram, a man who places himself in the forefront of the Indian social and political struggle in the name of truth and humanity, a veritable saint among politicians and a veritable politician among saints. Is there any wonder that this man immediately takes the very first place in the ranks of India's great leaders and becomes a great force that moved Indian humanity in a way that it was never moved before?

Non-violence to Gandhi, then, is the rock on which alone can great institutions be enduringly built. It is the one dynamic which can move both the masses and the classes and move them in the right direction. What form is this passion for truth and love for humanity to take, in order that they may become the most constructive factors for social change not only in Indian life, but also in the life of the world to-day? Here again Gandhi's interpretation is in harmony with India's present need and her agelong traditions. The essence of all great change is fight against wickedness, inertia, and tyranny of old forms and shibboleths. Gandhi voices this very demand for a drastic reconstruction: to him meek acceptance of the present order is death. The world's sceptre must be transferred to new hands. This means fiercest struggle in every sphere of life, between the old forces and the new. Gandhi does not merely try to reconcile this struggle with his non-violence: he makes this struggle merely the expression

of his faith in non-violence. Truth and justice are no longer abstract ideas remote from the affairs of men : they become live forces in the breasts of human beings. Non-violence " is not resignation from all real fighting against wickedness. On the contrary, the non-violence of my conception is a more active and more real fighting against wickedness than retaliation whose very nature is to increase wickedness. I contemplate a mental and therefore moral opposition to immoralities, I seek entirely to blunt the edge of the tyrant's word, not by putting up against it a sharper edged weapon, but by disappointing his expectation that I would be offering physical resistance. The resistance of the soul that I should offer instead would elude him. It would at first dazzle him and at last compel recognition from him, which recognition would not humiliate him but uplift him."[1]

Now we come to the exact form which non-violence takes as a method of social change. It is the ancient law of self-sacrifice. Love indeed is supreme and rules the world : but how ? Not by self-aggrandisement but by self-effacement. We die to live. We must vindicate the faith that is in us not by destruction of others, but by conscious suffering. " No country has ever risen without being purified through the fire of suffering. Mother suffers so that her child may live. The condition of wheat-growing is that the seed grain should perish; Life comes out of death. Will India rise out of her slavery without fulfilling this eternal law of purification through suffering ? "[2] There is a world of difference between the suffering which we infiict upon others or that which others inflict upon us and that which we impose upon ourselves for a definite laudable object. In a Satyagraha struggle there may be plenty of bloodshed; but the blood that is shed is of the Satyagrahis and not of their opponents. We assert a common humanity, we express our love for others, we

convince ourselves and others of the sincerity of our convictions by this ordeal of suffering through which we pass voluntarily. The result will be of course some violence, some injury to property, some loss of life: but these are radically different from the harm that we deliberately cause others for our own interests. The wrongs that we suffer are an assertion of our common humanity, our essential oneness: the wrongs that we inflict are a denial of that common humanity, that essential oneness. "It is not because I value life low that I can countenance with joy thousands voluntarily losing their lives for Satyagraha : but because I know that it results in the long run in the least loss of life, and what is more, it ennobles those who lose their lives and morally enriches the world for their sacrifice."[1]

Gandhi claims in all this no originality for his doctrine : he merely tries to redeliver the ancient message of Ahimsa in a new context. There are only two refinements in his theory : the doctrine is not to be understood now literally as non-killing : that it means the expression of our love of truth and humanity through our own suffering : and that the doctrine is now invoked more as a technique of social change and social salvation rather than as a technique of individual emancipation. The following quotation brings out clearly Gandhi's real view about Ahimsa (non-violence) :—" Just as a surgeon does not commit violence, but practises the purest Ahimsa, when he wields his knife on the patient's body for the latter's benefit, similarly one may find it necessary, in certain imperative circumstances, to go a step further and sever life from the body in the interest of the sufferer. It may be objected that, whereas the surgeon performs his operation to save the life of the patient, in the other case we do just the reverse. But on a deeper analysis it will be found that the ultimate object sought to be served

in both cases is the same–namely, to relieve the suffering soul within from pain.

"But the trouble with our votaries of Ahimsa is that they made of it a blind fetish and put the greatest obstacle in the way of the spread of true Ahimsa in our midst. The current (and, in my opinion, mistaken) view of Ahimsa has drugged our conscience and rendered us insensible to a host of other and more insidious forms cf violence, like harsh words, harsh judgments, ill-will, anger, spite, and lust of cruelty. It has made us forget, that there may be far more violence in the slow torture of men and animals, the starvation and exploitation to which they are subjected, out of selfish greed, the wanton humiliation and oppression of the weak and the killing of their self-respect, that we witness all round us to-day, than in the benevolent taking of life.

"It is this fundamental misconception about the nature and scope of Ahimsa–this confusion about the relative values–that is responsible for our mistaking mere non-killing for Ahimsa, and for the fearful amount of violence that goes on in the name of Ahimsa in our country.

" All life in the flesh exists by some violence. Hence the highest religion has been defined by a negative word, Ahimsa. The world is bound in a chain of destruction. In other words, violence is an inherent necessity for life in the body. That is why a votary of Ahimsa always prays for ultimate deliverance from the bondage of the flesh.

" None, while in the flesh, can thus be entirely free from violence, because one never completely renounces the will to live. Of what use is it to force the flesh merely if the spirit refuses to co-operate ? You may starve even unto death, but if at the same time the mind continues to

hanker after objects of sense, our fast is a sham and a a delusion. What, then, is the poor helpless slave to the will to live to do? How is he to determine the exact nature and extent of violence he must commit?

"Society has, no doubt, set down a standard and absolved the individual from troubling himself about it to that extent. But every seeker after truth has to adjust and vary the standard according to his individual need and to make a ceaseless endeavour to reduce the circle of violence."[1]

Gandhi's whole philosophy may be best summarised in the words Satya and Ahimsa--Truth and Non-violence. The sphere of application of these principles is very wide. In the domestic sphere or in the religious sphere, it had been freely applied before the time of Gandhi. A father may be unjust to a son: a husband may be unjust to a wife: a friend may be unjust to a friend. In each case, instead of putting up with the injustice, if one uses properly the weapon of Satyagraha, and wins over the other's side by the acceptance of suffering, one brings about a purification in the whole relationship. "Satyagraha literally means insistence on truth. This insistence arms the votary with matchless power. Satyagraha to be genuine, may be offered against parents, against one's wife, one's children, against rulers, against fellow-citizens, even against the whole world."[2] The instance of Prahlad, Daniel, and Hazrat Ali show that this type of Satyagraha is not a new thing. Prahlad would not give up the worship of God and preferred to bear the most terrible punishment cheerfully. Daniel did the same. Hazrat Ali kissed the hand of his adversary, when the latter spat upon him.

But Gandhi claims that the weapon will bring marvellous results, if it is applied in the political sphere. The

technique of Satyagraha is expected to take the place of war between nations and thus revolutionise the whole political life of humanity. Within one State, the methods of radical change, so far available, were constitutional agitation and mass rebellion. The Satyagraha here again combines the force of mass rebellion with the evolutionary quality of constitutional agitation. Methods of violence are proving more and more futile both in national and international sphere. The mere novelty of suggestion need not rule the new method out of court. "Till a new energy is harnessed and put on wheels, the captains of the older energies will treat the innovation as theatrical, impracticable, idealistic, and so on. We may be certain that the steam engineer was laughed at by the horse-dealer, till he saw that even horses could be transported by the steam engine. The electrical engineer was, no doubt, called a faddist and a mad man in steam-engine circles, till work was actually done over the wires. It may take long to lay the wires for international love, but the sanction of international Non-co-operation in preference to continued physical compulsion...is a distinct progress towards the ultimate and real solution."[1]

The adoption of the principle of non-violence in human affairs is bound to be a very slow affair. Whether it will ultimately come in or not, is not clear to-day. It is clear that humanity is to-day confronted by a great crisis. The alternative to war may not be easy to find out. International politics is so complex. There are some rooted beliefs upon which the political life of States rests. These will have to be modified, if a new order is to emerge. But in the meantime, the principle of non-violence, in the form in which Gandhi offers it, has much to recommend it. It does not shirk the fundamental issues. It is completely alive to the iniquities of the existing order. It recognises the restlessness that is coming over

humanity as a great force, if it is properly used. It provides a channel for orderly expression to it. It suggests a new technique to fight old evils. It offers a weapon which can be used by either fighting side with equal facility. It aims at bringing the economic and political life of humanity into harmony with its basic ethical and religious ideals. It tries to create a moral equivalent for war. It generates a force which owns no defeat. It expects qualities which are potentially possessed by all. It is based only on one assumption : " that there is something in man which is superior to the brute nature in him and the latter always yields to it...This force is to violence and, therefore, to all tyranny, all injustice, what light is to darkness."[1]

India is supremely qualified both by her weakness and her strength to deliver this message to-day to mankind. There is a great tradition of non-violence in her history. She has given birth to great religions of Ahimsa. She has produced an Ashoka whose non-violence has dazzled the imagination of mankind. She draws her inspiration from a philosophy which places unequivocally the supreme reality of the spiritual life in the forefront. The world is waiting for a lead. If India masters the lesson of non-violence to-day, she can give ocular demonstration of it on a large scale. The nation which leads in disarmament will have to take larger risks : but that and no other is the price of the moral leadership of humanity. But whatever may happen, Gandhi's faith rings clear and rings true. " If India makes violence her creed, and I have survived, I would not care to live in India. She will cease to evoke any pride in me. My patriotism is subservient to my religion. I cling to India like a child to its mother's breast, because I feel that she gives me the spiritual nourishment I need, she has the environment that responds to my highest aspirations.

When that faith is gone, I shall feel like an orphan without hope of ever finding a guardian. Then the snowy solitude of the Himalayas must give what rest it can to my bleeding soul."[1]

14. NON-CO-OPERATION.
THE GENESIS OF THE IDEA.

Satyagraha is insistence on truth. Insistence on truth does not sound a revolutionary cry, unless it takes possession of the masses and makes itself felt in politics and in society. Gandhi makes himself the spokesman of the Indian political cause and in the name of truth asks people to organise themselves and to go through the fire of suffering, in order to achieve their political objectives. The great political movements which he thus initiates are known as "Non-co-operation" and "Civil Disobedience." It has been, therefore, customary with many to interpret Satyagraha as Non-co-operation or Civil Disobedience. As a matter of fact, Satyagraha is the basic principle and may now express itself in co-operation and now in non-co-operation, now in the obedience to the constituted authorities and now as disobedience to the constituted authorities. Satyagraha, therefore, is wider and deeper than any of its occasional manifestations. But in the Indian struggle, the Satyagraha has acquired tremendous importance as the active manifestation of the principles of truth and non-violence in the political sphere, as non-co-operation or civil disobedience, under the leadership of Gandhi.

The Punjab wrongs and the Khilaphat question supplied the necessary occasion for Gandhi's Indian movement, known as non-co-operation. The official report about the Punjab appeared merely as official whitewash. How then was the nation to preserve its self-respect?

In all acts of injustice and terrorism there are two parties: the perpetrator of injustice and terrorism and the sufferer from injustice and terrorism. The sufferer is almost as responsible as the perpetrator, unless the sufferer refuses to be a willing party to it. In good old days of the Indian National Congress the people used to express themselves in the form of petitions. But these petitions have no value if the nation has no power to enforce them. Hence the nation must fall back on some way out. Such a way is non-co-operation. "Every nation and every individual has the right, and it is their duty to rise against an intolerable wrong. I do not believe in armed risings. They are a remedy worse than the disease sought to be cured. They are a token of the spirit of revenge and impatience and anger. The method of violence cannot do good in the long run...We have a better method. Unlike that of violence it certainly involves the exercise of restraint and patience: but it requires also resoluteness of will. This method is to refuse to be party to the wrong. No tyrant has ever succeeded in his purpose, without carrying the victim with him, it may be, as it often is, by force. Most people choose rather to yield to the will of the tyrant than to suffer for the consequence of resistance. Hence does terrorism form part of the stock-in-trade of the tyrant. But we have instances in history, where terrorism has failed to impose the terrorist's will upon his victim. India has the choice before her now. If, then, the acts of the Punjab Government be an insufferable wrong, if the report of Lord Hunter's Committee and the two despatches be a greater wrong by reason of their grievous condonation of these acts, it is clear that we must refuse to submit to this official violence. Appeal to the Parliament by all means, if necessary, but if the Parliament fails us, and if we are worthy to call ourselves a nation, we must refuse to uphold the Government by withdrawing

co-operation from it."[1]

The Muslim sentiment was roused by treatment meted out to the Turks at the end of the Great War. The Indian Muslims had fought for the British against their own co-religionists. They had promises from responsible British ministers that Turkey would not be punished. Their religious feelings were involved. The Hindus made a common cause with them. What were they to do to vindicate their position ? Gandhi's reply is again non-violent non-co-operation. " The barbarous method is warfare, open or secret. This must be ruled out if only because it is impracticable. If I could but persuade everyone that it is always bad, we should gain all lawful ends much quicker. The power that an individual or a nation forswearing violence generates, is a power that is irresistible. But my argument against violence to-day is based upon pure expedience i. e. its utter futility.

" Non-co-operation is, therefore, the only remedy left open to us. It is the cleanest remedy as it is the most effective, when it is absolutely free from all violence. It becomes a duty when co-operation means degradation or an injury to one's cherished religious sentiment."[2]

It was soon realised that the nation cannot expect to have its vital interests defended as long as it has no power to enforce its wishes. This power is Swaraj. What, then, is the most effective way to win it ? The British Government in India is based to some extent on force, but more on the voluntary co-operation of the Indians. If the Indians can withdraw their co-operation successfully the problem will be largely solved. " In the end, therefore, India must either learn the art of war which the British will not teach her, or she must follow her own way of discipline and self-sacrifice through Non-co-operation. It is as amazing as it is humiliating, that less than

one hundred thousand white men should be able to rule three hundeed and fifteen million Indians. They do so somewhat undoubtedly by force but more by securing our co-operation in a thousand ways and making us more and more helpless and dependent on them as time goes forward. Let us not mistake reformed councils, more law courts, and even governorships for real freedom or power. They are but subtler methods of emasculation. The British cannot rule us by mere force. And so they resort to all means, honourable and dishonourable, in order to retain their hold on India. They want India's billions and they want India's man-power for their imperialistic greed. If we refused to supply them with men and money, we achieve our goal, namely Swaraj, equality, manliness."[1]

Non-coperation is, therefore, an exceptional measure to meet an exceptional situation. Satyagraha may be said to be the goal of higher life: but not non-co-operation. Co-operation is the rule: non-co-operation is the exception. Gandhi considered himself privileged to have recourse to non-co-operation, because he had a fine record in co-operation with the British Government. "In my humble opinion, no Indian has co-operated with the British Government more than I have, for an unbroken period of twenty-nine years of public life, in the circumstances that might have turned any other man into a rebel."[2] The basis of this co-operation was neither selfishness nor fear: but the belief that on the whole the British Government was in the interests of India. Four times he had risked his life for the Empire. But the limit of his loyalty was reached in 1919: and he was driven to non-co-operation.

15. *THE MEANING OF NON-CO-OPERATION.*

Non-co-operation under the existing circumstances in India was an alternative to (a) meek and unconditional

acceptance of tyranny and injustice at the hands of the Government: (b) the method of constitutional agitation as practised by the Liberals, pressing for piecemeal reform; (c) the method of secret assassinations and open armed rebellion.

Now, Gandhi never accepts the right divine of rulers to govern wrong. Again and again, he asserts the right and duty of every individual to challenge the Government, in case of grave injustice, in the name of the individual conscience. "It is the inherent right of a subject to refuse to assist a Government that will not listen to him."[1]

Co-operation with the Government for any selfish purpose or out of fear is to Gandhi an absolutely unworthy attitude. Life has no meaning for him, if it is not a perpetual search for truth and justice and a perpetual fight against untruth and injustice. How can India meekly pocket insults and yet live as a self-respecting nation? When one man in the Punjab was made to crawl on his belly, the whole of India crawled on her belly. "It will be highly unconstitutional for the people of India to pocket every insult that is offered to them; it is highly unconstitutional for the whole of India to sit still and co-operate with an unjust Government which has trodden under its feet the honour of the Punjab. I say to my countrymen, as long as you have a sense of honour and so long as you wish to remain the descendants and defenders of the noble traditions that have been handed to you for generations after generations, it is unconstitutional for you not to non-co-operate and unconstitutional for you to co-operate with a Government which has become so unjust as our Government has become. I am not anti-English; I am not anti-British; I am not anti-any Government; but I am anti-untruth, anti-humbug and

anti-injustice. So long as the Government spells injustice, it may regard me as its enemy, implacable enemy."[1]

Gandhi's differences with the Liberals as regards the methods of obtaining redress of wrongs as well as attaining Swaraj are radical. There is nothing in non-co-operation which is unconstitutional. Gandhi's constitutionalism is bolder than the Liberals' constitutionalism. He does not want reform; he wants revolution. His spirit cannot be satisfied with the slow patient modifications of the existing machinery. "Reforms have already failed as they are bound to fail because they imply a compromise and co-operation with the principle of evil."

"Further, the acceptance of partial reforms takes away the ground under the reformer's feet. Science teaches us that a lever cannot move a body unless it has got a resting point outside the body against which it is applied. Similarly, in order to overcome evil one must stand wholly outside it i. e. on the firm, solid ground of unadulterated good."[2]

Gandhi, however, really pits himself against violence as a method of gaining political ends: and this not only on grounds of principle, but also on grounds of utility. Under the present circumstances of India, violence in the sense of open, armed rebellion is simply out of question. People have no arms and no training in arms. They are fast losing their military traditions. A century of compulsory disarmament has made them unfit for violence. The Government, besides, possesses a great organization, which has the advantage of the latest methods and inventions in modern warfare. Any policy of violence on the people's part, whether it is secret or open, is sure to call forth the whole might of the Government, upon the heads of the people and even to some extent justify

such an act of retaliation. This is the position of those who could not see eye to eye with Gandhi as regards the ideal of non-violence in all circumstances. Non-violence, as a principle, would work miracles: but in the meantime, for India even, non-violence as a policy is absolutely essential in the interests of the cause.

Non-violence, as a principle, under the circumstances of India, drives Gandhi and his followers to non-co-operation as the only honorable, as the only available, as the only effective method of righting Indian wrongs. For Gandhi, efficacious or not, any other method is simply out of question. He will never be a willing instrument for promoting a bloody revolution. " As soon as India accepts the doctrine of the sword, my life as an Indian is finished."[1] For Gandhi, therefore, there is the fight for justice based on " Yagna and Kurbani, " on sacrifice of self, not justice based on violence. Such non-violence is not a weapon of the weak, but a weapon of the strongest. Restraint may be a mark of real strength, not of weakness. To take up the pistol at the slightest pretext may be as cowardly as to run away from danger. The man who dares to die unarmed with his breast exposed to the enemy may be the greatest soldier. The core of courage does not consist in killing others, but in readiness to die. It is possible for a single true non-violent non-co-operator to defy the whole might of an Empire. " I want India to recognise that she has a soul that cannot perish and that can rise triumphant above every physical weakness and defy the physical combination of a whole world."[2] Non-co-operation based on this rock of non-violence, again, is a perfectly clean method. There is here no doctrine of justification of means by the end, because the means are a part of the end. The end is not any earthly object, but the assertion of truth.

Non-co-operation with the evil as a process of self-

sacrifice, a process of self-purification, based on love and truth and non-violence, is a moral and spiritual weapon, authorised in great religions of the world. Such non-co-operation is twice blessed, blessing both the doer and the receiver. In this process, suffering is unavoidable but this sort of suffering is the law of all development, all progress. The great difference of Gandhi with the usual type of Indian Liberalism is that he deliberately asked the nation to go through the ordeal of untold suffering for the sake of a great cause. This suffering is a great school of purification. In this school, the nation gets the opportunity to learn discipline, patience, courage, self-sacrifice, and to demonstrate the sincerity of its desire for freedom. Gandhi is talking as a realist, as a student of history, when he stresses the need of sacrifices and sufferings as preparations for Swaraj. "If Hampden had argued thus, he would not have withheld payment of ship-money, nor would Wat Tyler have raised the standard of revolt. English and French histories are replete with instances of men, continuing their pursuit of the right irrespective of the amount of suffering involved. The actors did not stop to think whether ignorant people would not have involuntarily to suffer. Why should we expect to write our history differently ? "[1]

But Gandhi fully realises that the conversion of India, to a policy of non-co-operation based on the principle of non-violence, cannot be done in a day. He, therefore, recommends the policy of non-violent non-co-operation as a matter of expediency. There is a world of difference between non-violence as a creed and non-violence as a policy. A creed has to be accepted, in all circumstances; a policy may be changed from time to time. A creed inspires complete confidence, creates a new atmosphere. A policy is held tentatively and is not free from an element of distrust. Non-violence as a creed is a

weapon of the strong: non-violence as a policy is a weapon of the weak. India is strong in numbers; but weak in every other way. For her, violence is out of question as a practicable proposition. For her, non-violence is a necessity of the situation.

But even as a matter of policy, Gandhian non-violence is different from the usual types of non-violence, current in the country. It is not born out of cowardice or inertia. It is the manifestation of all the energy which the country can produce, in a peaceful way. It is not to be used as a preparation for violence, in a covert way. They lie who say that non-violence is a further training in emasculation. It is really a training in manliness. A modern war cannot be successfully fought without drill, discipline, organisation, without courage and self-sacrifice of high order, and above all, a unity of purpose and a sturdy determination of the people. The non-violent non-co-operation, for those who believe in the possibility of future wars, and in the desirability of military training for Indians, is very useful as a preliminary preparation. What India above all needs is the force of a united and determined purpose. The fear of death in national cause should go. The fear of losing property in a national cause should go. There may be eventualities in future, when the nation may have to be ready for defence, internal as well as external. Gandhi does not believe in military resistance to be necessary: but he makes it clear that the preparation in his type of non-violence, far from weakening the nation, even from a physical and military point of view, really strengthens it. The exercise of physical force is certainly not an ideal: but it is far more desirable than cowardly submission to evil. He does not ask people to eschew violence in dealing with robbers or thieves or foreign invaders, not certainly at this stage. He will certainly advise the use of force,

if necessary, to defend the honour of our women. Non-violence even as a policy is higher stage. Self-defence is more honorable than cowardice: and self-immolation is higher than either. There must be capacity for self-immolation before non-violence can be taught.

India is to-day offered a choice between a violent revolt and peaceful revolt. Open, armed rebellion is not possible but the method of secret assassination is equally futile. Gandhi's belief is that India can never win real freedom through violence. " The attainment of freedom, whether for a man, a nation or the world, must be in exact proportion to the attainment of non-violence by each. Let those who believe in non-violence as the only method of achieving real freedom, keep the lamp of non-violence burning bright in the midst of the present impenetrable gloom."[1] " History teaches us that those who have, no doubt from honest motives, ousted the greedy, by using brute force against them, have in their turn become prey to the disease of the conquered."[2] The object-lesson of Europe is before us all. Nations there believe in violence and base their territorial possessions on their physical force. " And if India wishes to revise her ancient wisdom and to avoid the errors of Europe, if India wishes to see the kingdom of God established on earth instead of that of Satan which has enveloped Europe, then I would urge her sons and daughters not to be deceived by fine phrases, the terrible subtleties that hedge us in, the fears of suffering that we may have to undergo, but to see what is happening in Europe, and from it understand that we must go through the suffering even as Europe has gone through, but not the process of making others suffer. Germany wanted to dominate Europe and the Allies wanted to do likewise by crushing Germany. Europe is no better for Germany's fall. The Allies have proved themselves just as deceitful, cruel, greedy, and selfish as Germany was or

would have been. Victorious Germany would have avoided the sanctimonious humbug that one sees associated with the many dealings of the Allies."[1] The political world to-day is specialising more in the art of destruction. It is thereby ready for race-suicide.

Out of evil, good cannot come. Evil generates evil, as good generates good. Europe to-day is caught in this vicious circle. In vain it is pursuing the Will o' the Wisp of collective security. Collective security cannot be born out of collective greed or collective selfishness. Back of all politics in Europe is physical force. But physical force merely touches the superficial symptoms of the disease and not the disease itself. Force will not cease to govern mankind, as long as a higher consciousness does not dawn upon humanity. "Methods of violence, again, have not only failed in their purpose but have produced an effect opposite to what they were intended to produce. Because, when, one physical force comes upon the scene, it calls forth a superior physical force which subdues it for the time being. Then it puts forth more force and the chain of violence lengthens and lengthens. This method is wrong because it overlooks the fundamental fact that evil can never be overcome with evil, it ceases only through the good."[2]

The alternative is non-violent non-co-operation. That a policy of non-co-operation has risks, no one can deny. But it is attended with less risks than any other policy. A policy of indifference to the evil is infinitely more dangerous. A policy of tinkering with the machinery, without touching the roots is equally bad. A policy of violence is bound to break down in our hands: it will be playing in the hands of the enemy. It will give the Government the pretext to put down the movement by force. The great secret of non-violent non-co-operation in India is that it will completely upset the Government

which is so constituted as to deal with force, open or covert, but has no method of tackling this new type of movement. Secondly, this type of movement will bring in less suffering than a violent movement. Thirdly, there is less risk of disorder and anarchy in this movement than in the movement of violence. Non-violent non-co-operation is essentially a bloodless revolution, a peaceful movement. "I want no disordered order. I want no chaos. I want real order to be evoked out of this chaos which is misrepresented to me as order. If it is order established by a tyrant in order to get hold of the tyrannical reins of Government, I say that it is no order for me but disorder. I want to evolve justice out of injustice."[1] But let there be no mistake about the relative emphasis of Gandhi. He would prefer violence and risk violence a thousand times to national emasculation. He would prefer some disorder and temporary anarchy to passive acquiescence in grave injustice. "If I have to let the British people go and import temporary disorder and dislocation of national business, I will favour that disorder and dislocation than that I should have injustice from the hands of a great nation such as the British nation."[2] But it is the duty of all to try to secure change as far as possible by peaceful methods. Non-violent non-co-operation has this supreme merit of mobilizing change, with the possibility of a minimum of disorder and suffering. "Swaraj by non-violent means can never mean an interval of chaos and anarchy. Swaraj by non-violence must be a progressively peaceful revolution such that the transference of power from a close corporation to the people's representatives will be as natural as the dropping of a fully ripe fruit from a well-nursed tree."[3] Fourthly, non-violent non-co-operation was meant to prevent India from being a battlefield of communal forces. One of the great insights of Gandhi has been his consciousness of the internal weakness of Indians and his

consequent planning of a campaign which would root out the poison of violence in all its shapes and forms, from the body politic. "Acceptance of non-violence......will teach us to husband our corporate physical strength for a better purpose instead of dissipating it, as now, in a useless fratricidal strife, in which each party is exhausted after the effort."[1]

But in order that non-violent non-co-operation may fulfil these objects, its essentials must be clearly understood and firmly grasped. Its fundamental object was not the achievement of any political result, but the evolution of national strength from within. The nation is asked in all seriousness to look for her salvation not to any external agency but to herself. And how is that salvation to be achieved? The nation has to realise clearly in the first place her distinct existence. Non-co-operation was to be an attempt at self-purification, at self-organisation. It is a call not merely to a select few, but to the millions to shoulder the burdens of new Indian citizenship. It is really an attempt at securing co-operation among the people. A democracy may make itself conscious of its task by running the day to day administration through its representatives and exercising ceaseless vigilance and perpetual control over them on all occasions, small and great. This path is not open to India. It can then make itself conscious of its responsibility by with-drawing co-operation from Government. India under Gandhi's leadership tried the second alternative. If the people are denied all voice in vital decisons affecting them, they have the honourable path open to them of denying their co-operation to the Government. This one act of withdrawal of co-operation appears to be a negative one; but it implies nothing short of a movement at internal organisation on their own initiative, and under their own chosen leadership. "But the greatest thing in this campaign of

Non-co-operation is to evolve order, discipline, co-operation among the people, co-ordination among the workers."[1]

The strength of the British Raj in India lies in our helplessness. This helplessness is partly imaginary and partly real. The Indian lion has forgotten his essential nature and is hypnotised into the belief that he is a goat. It has been dinned into our ears, in season and out of season, that the British are indispensable, "for our internal and external security, for an armed peace between the Hindus and the Mussulmans, for our education, and for the supply of daily wants, nay, even for the settlement of religious squabbles."[2] The movement of non-co-operation was meant to get rid of this sense of helplessness.

In order that non-co-operation may achieve this objective of transforming the psychology of the Indian masses, it must be properly understood. The spirit behind the movement is more important than the achievement of concrete results. This has to be specially borne in mind, because non-violent non-co-operation is a movement absolutely new in the Indian political field: and because the non-violence invoked in the movement is to be a non-violence, largely of policy and not of creed. The essence of the whole movement was non-violence, not merely in the sense of abstention from killing, but abstention from hatred. Gandhi is never tired of drawing a line between the system and the persons who run the system. The fight is here against the system, not against the persons who represent the system. "Non-co-operation in the sense used by me must be non-violent and, therefore, neither punitive nor vindictive, nor based on malice, ill-will or hatred. It follows, therefore, that it would be sin for me to serve General Dyer and co-operate with him to shoot innocent men. But it will be an exercise of forgiveness or love for me to nurse him back to life, if he was suffering from a physical malady."[3] "We decline

to render official service to Sir George Lloyd the Governor; we dare not withhold social service from Sir George Lloyd the Englishman."[1] There must be honesty in the struggle. Even when we accept non-violence as a policy, we must preserve it in thought, word, and deed. We must be calm under the gravest provocation. We must not harbour ill-will against the co-operators with Englishmen, whatever happens. There is no doctrine of conditional non-violence here. Gandhi does not say that if and so far as the Government is non-violent, we shall be non-violent. He does not say that we must abstain from injury; he says we must abstain from anger, hatred, ill-will, and that even when one is subjected to the most terrible persecution. There should be no brag, no bluster, no bluff. The fight is really against ourselves, not against anyone else. It is against the cowardice that is in us, the pride that is in us. It is a struggle first and last for self-purification. "The spirit of non-violence necessarily leads to humility. Non-violence means reliance on God, the rock of ages. Non-co-operation is a test of sincerity. It requires solid and silent self-sacrifice. It challenges our honesty and our capacity for national work. It is a movement that aims at translating ideas into action. And the more we do, the more we find that much more must be *done* than we had expected. And this thought of our imperfection must make us humble...It is because so little is really required to be done and because all of that depends entirely upon ourselves that I have ventured the belief that Swaraj is attainable in less than one year."[2]

Non-violent non-co-operation is eminently an attempt at organising a democracy, in a perfectly democratic way. The Government claims to represent the masses. The Congress leaders claim to represent the same people. What then are facts? What is the general will?

What does the people's will demand? There should be, therefore, no attempt at coercion, direct or indirect, specially on the part of the Congress. If the issue is a faked one, if the country is not behind it, the non-co-operators are sure to be found out. The whole case of India's fitness for Swaraj rests not upon the Government's certificate, nor upon abstract arguments, or huge petitions, or empty mass demonstrations, but upon the people's will and ability to take their affairs into their own hands, to stand on their own feet and to dispense with all foreign or government assistance, in any form. There is nothing like co-operation if the Government sees eye to eye with the people and work out their common destiny in a harmonious way. If the Government is not responsive, if the Government pits itself against the plainly declared wishes and deeply cherished sentiments of the people, the clear duty of the people is to dissociate themselves from co-operation with the Government. But the declaration of a united people's attitude in India is not an easy matter. The way of violence is essentially un-democratic, whether tried by the Government or the people. The popular violence will be even worse than the governmental violence, because while the latter is a tyranny by a minority, the former will be a tyranny by a majority. There is no point in compelling people to be good against their will. Non-violence means social tolerance, social freedom for expression and organisation of opinion. The test of suffering is meant to show how far the movement is an expression of deep and genuine feeling on the part of the people.

The problem of India is a threefold one. There is the problem of rousing the public opinion, converting to the cause of freedom and justice, the doubtful, the indifferent, the selfish, and the hostile among the ranks of the Indian population, and to create a peaceful, constitutional

channel for the expression of the sentiment thus awakened. There is the problem of winning over the Englishmen both in India and in Great Britain to India's cause. There is, thirdly, the problem of convincing the outside world that the cause of India has a strong moral basis and is backed by the force of a united Indian public. The constitutional method of the Liberals goes very far in meeting this complex demand: but it does not carry with it the enthusiasm and intelligence of the vast masses of India. The Government charged the moderates with expressing the will of only a microscopic minority of the people. There was a wide gulf between the intelligentsia and the people, which the early Congress methods failed to bridge. The method of violence practised by a few terrorists was exceedingly undemocratic and had behind it no popular support at all. Besides, it would give a handle to the bureaucracy to do its worst. It is a game which suits the Government more than the people. Non-violence is an excellent strategy, if nothing more. The Government spider wants the Indian fly to walk into the parlour: will the Indian fly be so stupid as to fall into the net so cleverly laid by the opponents? Gandhi shows himself to be a first class political leader, the master of political strategy, when he elaborated a programme of non-violent non-co-operation "Non-violence is the most vital and integral part of non-co-operation. We may fail in everything else and still continue our battle if we remained non-violent. But we capitulate miserably, if we fail in adhering to non-violence. Let it be remembered that violence is the keystone of the Government edifice. Since violence is its sheet anchor and its final refuge, it has rendered itself almost immune from violence on our side, by having prepared itself to frustrate all violent effort by the people. We, therefore, co-operate with Government in the most active manner when we resort to violence. Any violence on our part must be a token of our stupidity, ignorance

and impotent rage. To exercise restraint under the gravest provocation is the truest mark of soldiership. The veriest tyro in the art of war knows that he must avoid the ambushes of his adversary. And every provocation is a dangerous ambush into which we must resolutely refuse to walk."[1]

One of the aims of non-violent non-co-operation is to inspire confidence in the minds of the most die-hard Englishmen that they are absolutely safe in India, that nothing is more remote from the hearts of the people than to hurt them. Gandhi is here trying to perform one of the greatest feats of history: he is trying to transform the very basis of a foreign rule from one of fear and hatred, into that of love and confidence. The Englishmen are surely superior to the system they represent. But the system is a degrading one both for the Indians as well as the English. Hence Gandhi invites the co-operation even of the Englishmen to join him in ending or mending a system, "which has made India subservient to a handful of you and which has made the Englishmen feel secure only in the shadow of the forts and the guns that obtrude themselves on one's notice in India. It is a degrading spectacle for you and for us. Our corporate life is based on mutual distrust and fear. This, you will admit, is unmanly. A system that is responsible for such a state of things, is necessarily satanic. You should be able to live in India as an integral part of its people and not always as foreign exploiters."[2] But he asks Indians to create an atmosphere of love and non-violence in India in which Englishmen may breathe absolutely freely. Gandhi is sure that human nature is the same all the world over: and love everywhere begets love. "Even a heart of flint will melt in front of fire kindled by the power of the soul. Even a Nero becomes a lamb when he faces Love."[3] The moment India sheds fear and

hatred born of weakness, India will become free. India "has no consciousness of her strength. She is conscious only of her weakness. If she is otherwise, there would be no communal problems nor political. If she was non-violent in the consciousness of her strength, Englishmen would lose their role of distrustful conquerors...If we, as Indians, can but for a moment visualise ourselves as a strong people disdaining to strike, we would cease to fear Englishmen whether as soldiers, traders, or administrators and they to distrust us. Therefore, if we become truly non-violent, we would carry Englishmen with us in all we do."[1]

Gandhi is out to convert a sceptical world, whether in India or outside, to the superb creed of love and truth. If India gets back her lost manhood, her lost faith in herself and wins her cause through the cleanest weapons available to humanity, she will give the world an ocular demonstration of the power of sacrifice and suffering, born out of love, on a large scale in the affairs of the world. That would be a great moment in the history of India. This gospel has behind it the great authority of the Rishis. It is so well suited to the law-abiding, peaceful Indian mentality. It is her mission, therefore, to redeliver that ancient message to a war-distracted world. Gandhi knows that some great nation has to lead the world in disarmament. That disarmament can only be based on a magnificent faith in God and the divine possibilities of human nature. A nation completely free from the spirit of greed, and the spirit of fear, bent on the conquest of herself and then of the whole world by its power of suffering and renunciation, can alone achieve this miracle. Such a nation is India. "The cause is doomed if anger, hatred, ill-will, recklessness, and finally violence are to reign supreme. I shall resist them all my life even if I should be alone. My goal is friendship with the world

and I can combine the greatest love with the greatest opposition to wrong."[1]

16. THE PROGRAMME OF NON-CO-OPERATION.

The administrative system in India is run with the tacit consent and actual co-operation of the Indians. If the Indians cannot control or influence vital decisions of the Government of India, or of the British Government, affecting them, they have only one peaceful method open to them, that of non-co-operation. Once the people's co-operation is withdrawn the sole responsibility for initiating great decisions and carrying them out will be that of the Government. A Government which will thus be carried on, without the consent and co-operation of the people, will be a pure imposition of force. " The movement of non-co-operation is nothing but an attempt to isolate the brute force of the British, from all the trappings under which it is hidden and to show that, brute force by itself cannot for one single moment hold India."[2]

The programme of non-co-operation was to be developed by stages. The first stage begins with the surrender of all titles, honours, and honorary offices. The Government consolidates its hold on the people in a number of ways. A Government title of Rao Bahadur or K. C. S. I. in normal times is a symbol of service: but under an unjust government, it becomes a " sign of servitude and dishonour. " Society is asked not to attach any value to titles or hold in special esteem title-holders. New titles come into being, titles which the country voluntarily confers on her leaders. Gandhi comes to be known as Mahatma Gandhi; Tilak becomes Lokamanya Tilak; Das becomes Deshabandhu Das and so on.

The boycott of Government schools and colleges

has become a subject of controversy. Gandhi's position is that "it is sinful to receive any education under the control of the present Government, no matter how high its quality may be, even as it would be to take the richest milk when it is tainted with poison."[1] If the Government is an unmixed evil, if the sum total of its activity is injurious to national growth, there is more degradation than elevation in receiving education controlled by the Government. There may be some intellectual loss: but the moral gain is great. The Government schools and colleges are slave-making institutions: their one object is to manufacture clerks and servants for the Government. Non-co-operation is a war of a non-violent type. When such a war is on, the students cannot peacefully pursue their studies in complete isolation from the realities in the country. Were not Oxford and Cambridge Universities deserted during the last Great War?

A similar call was made to the lawyers to boycott the law-courts. The law-courts, like schools and colleges, are institutions through which the Government tries to strengthen its power over the people. Once you declare holy war on the Government, how can you think of getting justice from its law-courts? There is a halo round all Government institutions: but behind all of them there is one aim, the maintenance of the authority of the Government. Gandhi was out to destroy its moral prestige and the appearance of respectability.

Nothing, however, differentiates Gandhi's method more radically from the prevalent liberal methods than the attempt to boycott the Councils and Government services. This was meant to give a clear lead to the people. These institutions are masks which the Government puts on in order to hide the ugly nakedness of its iron rule. The people's representatives are used to give an appea-

rance of popular or Indian support to the decisions of the Government. That is why Gandhi is up in arms against the whole system. The whole theory that these institutions give Indians opportunities for self-development is now given up. The greatest of Indians become mere tools in the hands of this foreign bureaucracy, the moment they accept a place under it. "Englishmen are not by nature corrupt. Indians are not necessarily angels. Both succumb to their environment...What I am attacking is the system. I have no quarrel with the Englishmen as such. I honour individuals among them to-day as I did before my discovery of the unimprovableness of the existing system. If anything, Mr. Andrews and other Englishmen I could name, are nearer to me than before. But I could not tender my homage even to him who is more than a brother to me, if he became the Viceroy of India. I would distrust his ability to remain pure, if he accepted the office. He would have to administer a system that is inherently corrupt and based on the assumption of our inferiority. Satan mostly employs comparatively moral instruments and the language of ethics to give his aims an air of respectability. I have digressed a little for the purpose of showing that this Government, if it was wholly manned by Indians but worked as it now is, would be as intolerable to us as it is now."[1]

17. CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE VS. THE CREED OF VIOLENCE.

Non-co-operation in its most intensive form means either the end of Government or its complete transformation. In its third and fourth stages, the Government servants were to be called upon to give up Government service, the police and the military were to resign, and

the people were to withhold payment of taxes.

The Gandhian peaceful revolt was to terminate in non-payment of taxes and mass civil disobedience. Here Gandhi is poles asunder from the Liberals' policy. Law and order are fundamental in the Liberal method: to Gandhi they merely mean very often the maintenance and perpetuation of the *status quo*. To Gandhi anything is better than an impotent accuiescence in grossest injustice and vilest tyranny, in the name of law and order. He is, therefore, never tired of repeating that non-co-operation and civil disobedience are the inherent rights of citizens, to be practised only if circumstances really demand them.

Truth and insistence on truth, known as Satyagraha form the basis of Gandhi's philosophy. But Satyagraha may issue in co-operation as well as non-co-operation, obedience to laws as well as violation of laws, active obedience or passive resistance. Gandhi, at any rate, is not prepared to say that it may also take the form of violent resistance or war. Here he tries to distinguish himself from earlier interpretations of Ahimsa in Hindu Philosophy as well as in recent Hindu political thought of B. C. Pal, Lokamanya Tilak and Arobindo Ghosh. While violence has a certain place in Gandhi's creed, it is not Satyagraha. Conditional non-violence also is not Satyagraha. Unconditional non-violence is Satyagraha. Satyagraha or soul-force "excludes the use of violence because man is not capable of knowing the absolute truth, and, therefore, not competent to punish."[1]

The peculiarity of Gandhi's creed does not lie in his insistence on truth or on soul-force, but on the way in which he interprets truth or soul-force. Its most characteristic expression is civil disobedience. Non-co-operation is not necessarily civil disobedience. But civil disobedience is the coping-stone of Gandhian methods of organising

conflict with the existing institutions. It is not merely withdrawal of co-operation: it is active opposition to the laws of a state or society. The practice of civil disobedience is bound to bring matters to a crisis. The irreconcilables want the existing organisation to bend or break, to mend or end.

Civil disobedience is non-co-operation in its most active form. The essence of both is the same, opposition to evil by non-violence, not by inflicting suffering on others, but by inviting suffering on oneself. In the political sphere, it takes the form of opposing wrong and error in the shape of unjust laws. The disobedience to laws is not held as laudable in itself. It is to be practised only as a last necessity, when obedience to these laws is a positive sin. Secondly, this disobedience should be carefully distinguished from criminal violation of laws. The ordinary law-breaker looks at the law from the point of view of his own interests. He disobeys it stealthily and tries to avoid the penalty. But the civil resister thinks first and foremost of the well-being of the society. His attitude towards the State and its law is normally that of respect and obedience. It is only when his conviction is that obedience to certain laws is a dishonour, that he makes up his mind to resist them. But whether he obeys or disobeys, there is no fear of sanctions for him; nor is there any selfish motive operative. His resistance is open; his resistance is civil, courteous, non-violent; he willingly suffers from the penalties of their violation. He may disobey not only very unjust laws, but also such other laws whose breach does not involve moral turpitude and withdraw his co-operation from the State, "in order to register his protest against the action of the law-givers."[1]

Thus Gandhi distinguishes between defensive civil disobedience and aggressive civil disobedience. Defensive civil disobedience is "involuntary or reluctant, non-vio-

lent, disobedience of such laws as are in themselves bad, and obedience to which would be inconsistent with one's self-respect or human dignity. Thus formation of volunteer corps for peaceful purposes, publication of articles not contemplating or inciting to violence, in spite of prohibitory orders is defensive civil disobedience."[1] Aggressive, assertive or offensive civil obedience is "non-violent wilful disobedience of laws of the State, whose breach does not involve moral turpitude and which is undertaken as a symbol of revolt against the State. Thus disregard of laws relating to revenue or regulation of personal conduct for the convenience of the State, although such laws themselves inflict no hardships and do not require to be altered, would be assertive, aggressive or offensive civil disobedience."[2]

Civil disobedience is based on the principle that the highest law which regulates human conduct is the dictate of one's own conscience. It makes the principle of ethical autonomy of the individual supreme in one's life and not the principle of obedience to an external authority like the State or society. Truth is the highest law of our being: and truth, as one sees it, to a rightly constituted individual, ought to be higher than one's country, or one's Government or any other thing. Needless to say, that for the practice of this creed, the highest qualifications are necessary. It is not given to every one to try to make himself or herself a fit recipient of truth. Truth is not the monopoly of a few intellectuals: it is the natural light shining or capable of shining in every one of us. The preparation is to be ethical, rather than intellectual. Life is an eternal process in pursuit of truth. The more earnest we are, the greater are our chances for getting it. Ask and it shall be given. Knock and it shall be opened.

The civil resister stakes his all on the pursuit of truth. He is expected to be free from greed, anger, hate,

fear. No one can worship both God and Mammon. The mandate is: Leave all and follow me. To the civil resister, even love of body, or love of life must give way to his ideal. It is this spirit of consecration, of sacrifice that makes even a single Satyagrahi irresistible. Gandhi's theory is that one perfect Satyagrahi can win India's cause. The Satyagraha compaign requires high quality of sacrifice, not quantity of sacrifice. A Satyagrahi depends for success not on numbers but on truth, and on his capacity to suffer for his cause. "Working under this law of our being, it is possible for a single individual, to defy the whole might of an unjust empire to save his honour, his religion, his soul, and lay the foundation for that empire's fall or its regeneration."[1] "The exercise of the purest soul-force in its perfect form, brings about instantaneous relief. For this exercise, prolonged training of the individual soul is an absolute necessity, so that a perfect Satyagrahi has to be almost, if not entirely, a perfect man."[2]

There is then no perfect Satyagrahi, as there is no perfect man. Gandhi himself does not claim to be one. He has set up a high standard of moral perfection, which human beings at their best can try to reach, but which they can never attain. What is needed is perfect purity of thought, word, and deed, perfect selflessness, perfect love of truth and endless capacity of suffering for it.

Civil resistance is an extreme measure designed not for embarrassment of a Government, but for self-purification. It is certainly not to be undertaken light-heartedly, on a flimsy pretext. "It is difficult to know what is truth, when to defend it to the point of Civil Resistance and how to avoid error in the shape of violence in one's pursuit after Truth."[3] Civil Disobedience is like the use of a knife; it should be used very sparingly and in exceptional circumstances. Its use must be hedged round with all necessary safeguards and precautions. The greatest

safeguard is an atmosphere of non-violence. If people emphasise the word disobedience and forget the word 'civil' the result is certain destruction. Gandhi admits that it is possible to doubt the wisdom of applying it, in respect of a particular act or law.

Here a line has to be drawn between individual civil disobedience and mass civil disobedience. No individual can give up the right of practising it without ceasing to be a man. "It is a birthright that cannot be surrendered without surrender of one's self-respect."[1] The right to practise civil disobedience becomes a positive duty in certain circumstances, when the State becomes lawless or corrupt. "When neglect of the call becomes a denial of God, civil disobedience becomes a peremptory duty."[2] Mass civil disobedience is a political movement, an intensive agitation, and even possibly a revolution. It can be tried only in a calm atmosphere. But it is more dangerous even than an armed rebellion, which can be put down by force. Complete civil disobedience cannot be so put down. There is a refusal to recognise the State and its laws, backed by the determination to face extreme suffering. The success of such a movement depends upon the intensity of conviction of the people, and their complete innocence and harmlessness. The public conscience is sure to be roused and make itself felt, until the victory is assured to the civil resisters.

Civil disobedience is meant to combat the violence both of the people and of the Government. Gandhian movement is meant to give an effective means of self-expression to the forces in the country which are making for a violent revolution. Gandhi asks the revolutionaries to come out in the open and boldly speak out their minds. There should be no sham, no hypocrisy, no hole and corner methods in politics. Politics should not be based on weakness and fear. The people should be asked to

fear God, and not man, their conscience within and not the authorities without. "Dacoities and assassinations cannot be productive of any good. These...are absolutely a foreign growth in India. They cannot take root here and cannot be a permanent institution here. History proves that assassinations have done no good. The religion of this country, the Hindu religion, is abstention from 'himsa' that is, taking animal life."[1]

But while condemning the party of violence, as inconsistent with the highest ideals of ethics and religion, with the ideals of Hindu culture, as cowardly, insincere, and hypocritical, as politically not only futile, but fraught with the highest mischief to the country, and as a thoughtless imitation of Western methods, Gandhi recognised that behind that party were important forces seeking necessary expression. The country was sick of the slow march of reform and condemned the so-called constitutional methods as absolutely sterile. The country demanded a policy of drastic action, of sterling patriotism, of highest effectiveness. Civil resistance offers to the impatient idealist a very dynamic programme, capable of doing the maximum of good, with the minimum of evil. :"There is undoubtedly a party of violence in the country. It is growing in strength. It is as patriotic as the best amongst us. What is more, it has much sacrifice to its credit. In daring, it is not to be surpassed by any of us...But whilst I admire and adore their patriotism, I have no faith whatsoever in their method. They and I are as poles asunder. India's salvation does not lie through violence. I am convinced that their methods have cost the country much more than they know or will care to admit. But they will listen to no argument, however reasonable it may be, unless they are convinced that there is a programme before the country which requires at least as much sacrifice as the tallest amongst them is prepared to make.

They will not be allured by our speeches, resolutions, or even conferences. Action alone has any appeal for them. This appeal can only come from non-violent action which is no other than civil resistance. In my opinion, it and it alone, can save the country from impending lawlessness and secret crime."[1]

The war against the assassination creed by Gandhi is based on the highest principle and the highest expediency. There may be sacrifice, courage, and patriotism behind these revolutionaries: but the resulting evil becomes greater because of these. Hence no activity is more misleading and harmful than the activity of the violence party. God may be incarnating Himself for the destruction of the wicked: but the revolutionaries must not arrogate to themselves the role of the deity. Nor is it proper to compare the revolutionary to Guru Govind Singh or Washington or Garibaldi or Lenin. Gandhi disagrees with these heroes so far as they had faith in war: they are not proper guides in life so far. But above all, he asks these misguided patriots to be realistic and to face facts. Let them realise " that India is not like Turkey or Ireland or Russia and that revolutionary activity is suicidal at this stage of the country's life at any rate, if not for all time in a country, so vast, so hopelessly divided and with the masses so deeply sunk in pauperism and so fearfully terror-struck. "[2]

It is so essential to dispose of adequately, the coils of sophistry, in which the violence cult gets stuck again and again. The idea that freedom can only be won by violence has got a secret but persistent hold, not merely on the handful of terrorists, but also on many others who have not the courage to practise their creed. The first thing that India should realise is that the path of open warfare is not available to her to-day. " If an open warfare were a possibility, I may concede that we may

tread the path of violence that the other countries have trod and at least evolve the qualities that bravery on the battlefield brings forth. But attainment of Swaraj through warfare, I hold to be an impossibility for any time that we can foresee."[1] The cult of secret assassination is radically different: it does not appeal to Gandhi at all. The greatest heroes of the world like Shivaji or Washington were not secret assassins. The cult of assassination may dazzle a youngster, a tyro: but whether it appears as the cult of the bomb or open warfare, it is a primitive method, unsuited to the advancing ethical mind of to-day. The analogy of a surgical operation has been used often: but it "is absolutely misleading in a number of ways. The surgeon operates on the body to benefit the body: he does not bother about the soul. The revolutionary's aim is to benefit the country, and to achieve this aim, he is prepared to destroy his adversary, body and soul. Here there is an injury to another without his consent and without doing any good to him."[2] The method of violence, because it does not touch the soul, helps in perpetuating the evil. The same person is reborn with the same tendencies. "That to my mind is the meaning of the persistence of evil and the crimes we see about us. The more we punish, the more persistent crimes become. They may change colour, but the substance is the same."[3] Non-violence will always remain infinitely superior to violence, because here the souls react upon souls, the conversion is a deep and lasting process, and both the individual soul and the social evil are touched not merely on the surface, not merely temporarily, but in their very essential nature and therefore lastingly.

There are, however, patriots who are so bent on getting political freedom that they would not scruple about the means. They have no mind to go into the metaphysical subtleties of the problem. They will fain meet

violence with violence, cunning with cunning. They pose as practical politicians, ardent patriots, men impatient about foreign rule than anything else. The sole test for them is the practicality of a method. To them Gandhi will say: although I am deadly opposed to you and will fight you to death, you are welcome to your method, if it brings you your much coveted political freedom. But when we examine facts soberly, it becomes quite clear to us that a few assassinations may throw the Government into consternation, they will not oust it. They will harden it and make it absolutely brutal. They will egg it on to do its worst and give it necessary justification for adopting methods of wholesale terrorism. This has actually happened in those parts, where the terrorist has appeared. Now, repression may be a stimulant or a tonic but only to those who are out for it, and are prepared to meet it. But the masses soon become terrorised into submission to any extent. Even the ordinary patriotic activities become tabooed by the Government. The result is a complete set-back for the people.

It is insensate folly to play with fire in a perfectly reckless fashion in the name of the country. Martyrdom is an excellent thing: but it must be earned by a life of perfect innocence, perfect truth, and perfect concentration on one's ideal.

The path to Swaraj is not so easy as is implied in the revolutionaries' method. A few assassinations cannot solve India's problem: they may even make the problem of India almost impossible of solution. Even if we manage to kill all Englishmen, our troubles will not end. They will only begin. The disease is deeper: the remedy must be equally deeper. Here, Gandhi is more one with the Indian Liberals than with the Tilakite nationalists. Military methods, even if they succeed, mean mere substitution of one arbitrary rule for another. It is not the

Swaraj which matters for Gandhi, it is the type of Swaraj which matters. Swaraj obtained by violence is different from Swaraj obtained by non-violence. The sooner we realise that the evil is essentially internal and, therefore, the cure must be internal, the better. The great forces of history, the great forces of human nature come in our way. What is, therefore, required is a revolution from within, a psychological transformation in terms of motives, habits, character. "I do not believe that the killing of even every Englishman can do the slightest good to India. The millions will be just as badly off as as they are to-day, if someone made it possible to kill off every Englishman to-morrow. The responsibility is more ours than that of the English for the present state of things. The English will be powerless to do evil if we will but do good. Hence my incessant emphasis on reforms from within."[1] "Warfare may give us another rule for the English rule but not self-rule in terms of the masses. The pilgrimage to Swaraj is a painful climb. It requires attention to details; it means vast organising ability; it means penetration into the villages solely for the service of the villagers. In other words, it means national education i. e. education of the masses. It means an awakening of national consciousness among the masses. It will not spring like the magician's mango-tree. It will grow almost unperceived like the banian tree. A bloody revolution will never perform the trick. Haste is most certainly waste."[2]

The most powerful weapon in the hands of the non-violent, non-co-operating people is the non-payment of taxes. Non-payment does not mean escaping the liabilities of citizenship. No Government can run without the payment of taxes: but if you do not want a Government to run, the most effective non-violent method is to stop the supplies. But this implies considerable previous train-

ing of the masses in non-violence and self-purification.

But while the theory of civil resistance is clear in practice, there are grave risks. The gravest risk is that of lawlessness, anarchy, and bloodshed. Under certain circumstances such risks have to be run. Anything is better than national emasculation. "The victories of truth have never been won without risks, often of the gravest character. Conversion of a nation that has consciously or unconsciously preyed upon another, far more numerous, far more ancient, and no less cultured than itself, is worth any amount of risk."[1] Gandhi, in 1930 becomes bolder than Gandhi in 1922. His non-violence has to fight not merely violence of the Government, but also the non-violence of the wrong type of the people. Nothing has brought more confusion into the proper understanding of Gandhi's creed than the ambiguity inherent in the non-violence, standing ordinarily for tameness, cowardice, abstention from killing, but meaning in Gandhi's mind the most heroic assertion of the truth that is in one's soul. Non-violence of Gandhi is more antithetic to the non-violence or passivity that has come over India than to the violence of the Western people. Gandhi will stake his all upon his non-violence, which means the most aggressive assertion of our ideals ever known to man. How can it tolerate supineness, passivity, meek submission to evil, inertia and indifference in the face of the most crying wrongs, flight from the world when the world is on fire, in the name of non-violence? Gandhi would not free the country by methods of violence: he would even fight such methods by all the weapons at his command: but he would not fold his hands in despair, because every alternative has grave risks attending it. Better for him is the violence that ensues in a fight for freedom: better for him is the anarchy which sometimes temporarily results in all revolts against the existing authority, than that

state of abject slavery and lifelessness which has been this country's lot for a century or more. He will not choose them: he will even fight them: but he will risk them if necessary in his fierce fight for truth. "We must cease to dread violence if we will have the country to be free. Can we not see that we are tightly pressed in the coil of violence? The peace we seem to prize is a mere make-shift, and it is bought with the blood of starving millions. If the critic could only realise the tortures of the slow and lingering death brought about by forced starvation, they would risk anarchy and worse, in order to end that agony."[1]

18. BOYCOTT OF FOREIGN CLOTH.

Gandhi's method of resistance to the Government includes boycott of foreign cloth. The word 'boycott' has unpleasant associations and often indicates ill-will or contempt, and the word 'foreign' also imports racial and national prejudice into the non-co-operation agitation. There was further destruction of foreign cloth organised all over India under the guidance of Gandhi. How will Gandhi reconcile all this with non-violence?

It should be made clear that there is no boycott of British cloth only: there is, therefore, no war against any one country only. Secondly, the mandate of the Congress is not against all foreign articles, but only against foreign cloth. India is thus trying to decide what is good for her to accept from outside countries and what is not good for her to accept. There is, therefore, no vindictiveness, no discrimination, no economic war implied in the determination of the country to discard foreign cloth. Has India any right to control her own economic policy? She has not the legal right: but she can exercise the moral right in the way she thinks fit. The racial feeling is

there in the background all along: Gandhi is trying to transfer it from men to things.

"If the emphasis were on all foreign things, it would be racial, parochial, and wicked. The emphasis is on all foreign cloth. The restriction makes all the difference in the world. I do not want to shut out English lever watches or the beautiful Japanese lacquer work. But I must destory all the choicest wines of Europe, even though they might have been prepared and preserved with all the more exquisite care and attention. Satan's snares are most subtly laid and they are the most tempting, when the dividing line between right and wrong is so thin as to be imperceptible. But the line is there all the same, rigid and inflexible. Any crossing of it may mean certain death...

"Love of foreign cloth has brought foreign domination, pauperism, and what is worst, shame to many a home. The reader may not know that not long ago hundreds of 'untouchable' weavers of Kathiawad having found their calling gone, became sweepers for the Bombay Municipality. And the life of these men has become so difficult that many lose their children and become physical and moral wrecks: some are helpless witnesses of the shame of their daughters and even their wives...

"Is it now any wonder, if I consider it a sin to touch foreign cloth? Will it not be a sin for a man with a very delicate digestive apparatus to eat rich foods? Must he not destroy them or give them away?

"If destruction of foreign cloth be a sound proposition from the highest moral standpoint, the possibility of a rise in the price of Swadeshi is the quickest method of stimulating production. By one supreme effort and swift destruction, India has to be awakened from her torpor and enforced idleness.

"Foreign cloth to India is like foreign matter to the body. The destruction of the former is as necessary for the health of India as of the latter for the health of the body."[1]

In another article, Gandhi gives two reasons for the burning of foreign cloth: (1) it revives black memories and is a mark of shame, the East India Company having forced it on us, and it is an emblem of slavery; (2) the poor should not be given foreign clothes, for they ought not to be dead to patriotism, dignity, and respect.

19. LIMITS OF NON-CO-OPERATION.

It was made clear from the beginning that non-co-operation was all along directed against a system, not against any individuals. This point is fundamental in the whole idea. It is Gandhi's firm belief that the best of us are victims more or less of systems, and individually can rise above them. It is certainly open to individuals to dissociate themselves from a system which they find unjust: but it is not always desirable or practicable to do so. Every Englishman by birth belongs to a different order of civilisation to what an Indian by birth belongs to. Some Englishmen have risen superior to the system and have identified themselves with the Indian cause; but how many are these? Then, there is the governing caste in India, represented by the bureaucracy. Here, also, exceptions occur; and a few have broken loose from the system. But, again, how many? The system, therefore, in most cases, is bound to swallow up individuals. Each of us has a point of view, which is very much coloured by the community we are born in, by the group to which we belong, by the caste of which we form a part. But it is the system which spoils us; and we can always distinguish the individuals from the system they are supposed to represent.

The line is difficult to draw in practice. But it is Gandhi's conviction that there is no man who is so hopelessly bad as to be dead to all call of honour or principle. There is the spark of divinity in the worst of us: and when the most hardened sinners among us are properly touched, the innermost springs are moved, and we can see a higher life welling up from within. It has been again and again observed that individual Englishmen and English women are not a bit worse than individual Indians. Why should we hate them then? And what right have we to hate any one of God's creations? There is some failing, some limitation, some imperfection in the best of us: must we, therefore, run down the whole humanity? Do we not actually draw a line between the good and the evil in a person, often love and respect the former and ignore the other? Gandhi is trying to combine the strongest love for the individuals with the most powerful opposition to the principle they stand for, if that principle is wrong. It may be difficult to practise this ideal: but it is undoubtedly the ideal. This is the meaning of non-violence in non-co-operation, "civil" in civil disobedience: and this is why this creed is not to be practised by any one who cannot reach this ideal. Non-co-operation can degenerate into violence and civil disobedience degenerates into criminal disobedience, only if this essential basis of the theory is forgotten. "I have discovered that man is superior to the system he propounds. And so I feel that you (an Englishman) as an individual are infinitely better than the system you have evolved as a corporation...Hence it is that an Englishman in office is different from an Englishman outside. Similarly, an Englishman in India is different from an Englishman in England. Here, in India, you belong to a system that is vile beyond description. It is possible, therefore, for me to condemn the system in the strongest terms, without considering you to be bad and without imputing

bad motives to every Englishman."[1]

The idea of a social boycott, therefore, is abhorrent to Gandhi. Social boycott is a very powerful weapon, and in a caste-ridden and custom-bound country like India, will work havoc. But we must be aware of the danger inherent in its use. Non-co-operation was meant to release the moral energies of the nation, to give full expression to the people who dared to differ radically in vital matters from their rulers. The great principle upon which it was based was individual conscience, individual sense of right and wrong. The fight was of a majority against a minority. The terrorism of a minority by a majority will be infinitely worse than the Governmental tyranny. Compulsion in every form ought to be eliminated from the struggle. Gandhi was out to vindicate that the whole governmental system was based merely on brute force and his whole case rested, therefore, on fighting it with a weapon which eliminated force in all forms. Tolerance and the completest freedom of opinion were absolutely necessary for the success of India's cause. Social boycott means compulsion of an individual by group: and once compulsion begins to work, the whole basis of the movement changes. "Social boycott is an age-old institution. It is coeval with caste. It is the one terrible sanction exercised with great effect. It is based upon the notion that a community is not bound to extend its hospitality or service to an excommunicant. It answered when every village was a self-contained unit, and the occasions of recalcitrancy were rare. But when opinion is divided, as it is to-day, on the merits of non-co-operation, when its new application is having a trial, a summary use of social boycott in order to bend a minority to the will of the majority is a species of unpardonable violence. If persisted in, such boycott is bound to destroy the movement. Social boycott is applicable and

effective when it is not felt as a punishment and accepted by the organisers of boycott as a measure of discipline. Moreover, social boycott, to be admissible in a compaign of non-violence, must never savour of inhumanity. It must be civilised. It must cause pain to the party using it, if it causes inconvenience to its object. Thus, depriving a man of the services of a medical man, is an act of inhumanity tantamount in the moral code to an attempt to murder. I see no difference in murdering a man and withdrawing medical aid from a man who is on the point of dying."[1] But this does not mean that the non-co-operators may not avoid social intercourse with him. "A man who defied strong, clear public opinion on vital matters is not entitled to social amenities and privileges. We may not take part in his social functions such as marriage feasts; we may not receive gifts from him. But we dare not withhold social service. The latter is a duty. Attendance at dinner parties and the like is a privilege which it is optional to withhold or extend."[2]

20. CONSTRUCTIVE NATION-BUILDING PROGRAMME.

There have been acute controversies over the Gandhian methods of organising social and political change: but there is a greater unanimity as regards the more positive side of the same method. Destruction and construction to some extent go hand in hand. The process, therefore, of destroying the prestige of some old institutions was to some extent necessary in order to enable people to transfer their allegiance from them to the new institutions. Institutions rest in the last resort on the beliefs of the people: and these beliefs, therefore, should change before the institutions can undergo change.

The revolutionary method of swift destruction,

whether by violent or non-violent ways has a certain dramatic quality about it. It stirs up imagination : it rouses emotions : it moves the whole man. But the method leads nowhere unless construction accompanies destruction. The Liberal's great objection to all such revolutionary methods is that they lead necessarily to anarchy and chaos. It is easier to destroy than to build. The work of centuries can be destroyed in a few days or a few months. But the work of construction is a vastly more difficult process. Gandhi sees this very clearly and hence avoids the mistake of the violence party. Non-violent non-co-operation is essentially meant to be a constructive movement. It has, however, one or two decisive advantages over the Liberal method. It does not attack the Indian problem piecemeal, but as a whole; it does not ask for tinkering here or tinkering there, but a reconstruction all round. It does not demand reform : it demands revolution. Secondly, it has the dramatic intensity of a revolutionary movement. It appeals not merely to the head, but also to the heart : and it mobilises the emotional idealism of the fiery patriots by its apparently destructive character. Gandhi's whole strategy consists in harnessing the minds of firebrands to patient, constructive work, while showing them the side of the movement which appealed to them most. Gandhi has nothing in common with the crude mentality of a terrorist who glorifies the murder of a few Englishmen, and thinks that he has sacrificed his life and solved the country's problem by a heroic deed. Gandhi is a revolutionary who is at heart a perfect Liberal: and a Liberal who has chosen the revolutionary's role. His heart bleeds for co-operation, while he is preaching and practising non-co-operation. His perpetual emphasis on constructive work as a preliminary preparation for intensive non-co-operation and mass civil disobedience shows that while he talks of revolution, he means evolution,

while he talks of obtaining Swaraj within one year, he really means to lay down the foundations of Swaraj in the minds and hearts of the Indian people. Like a first class general, he realizes that the normal processes of evolution as envisaged by the British Government and also to some extent by the Liberals, are too slow to move the mind of the people: hence his advocacy of non-co-operation and civil disobedience, meant to serve the double purpose of removing the lethargy both of the Government and of the people, who would otherwise sleep in the name of *Laissez faire.*

Constructive work, therefore, is the heart of Gandhi's method and his programme. Constructive work has a very wide sweep: it practically means the work of an all-round reorganisation by the nation. The country has to evolve Swaraj by its own sacrifices and exertions: it has to convince itself and then the world that apart from and independently of the Government, it can run its own life quite satisfactorily.

21. *THE HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY.*

In the forefront of Gandhi's programme for the achievement of Swaraj is Hindu-Muslim unity. The Muslims all along were trying to organise an independent political party: they were not willing to merge in the Indian National Congress. In 1916, the Muslim League and the Congress had joined hands. Gandhi realised the fundamental weakness of the Indian case and made a magnificent effort to link up the two communities in a common political struggle.

The search for a democratic Swaraj becomes a search for mirage, as long as the two great communities in India deeply distrust each other and pick up a quarrel

with each other on all types of pretexts. United only we will stand. Divided we will fall. The Hindu-Muslim disunion provides ample justification for a foreign rule.

What are the factors which make for this distrust and antagonism? The quarrel at bottom is not a real religious quarrel. Nothing in the Koran impels the Mahommedans to distrust the Hindus. Nothing in the Shastras forces Hindus to fight the Muslims. Interested priests may now and then set up the one community against the other. But the two great faiths of Hinduism and Islam, when properly understood, lead to peace and harmony, and not discord.

The Hindu theory of caste may be good or bad: but it is not a barrier to unity. Caste-theory makes it impossible for Hindus and Muslims to dine together or marry amongst each other. Inter-dining and inter-marriage certainly help social unity: but they are not indispensable to it. Nations which inter-marry and inter-dine continue to fly at each other's throat: and nations which do not inter-marry or inter-dine remain friendly with each other.

The cow problem sometimes proves troublesome. The cow is sacred to the Hindu: but there is nothing in Islam which makes the killing of cows a sacred duty. The question must be tackled in a practical spirit. "The cow question is a big question, the greatest for the Hindu. I yield to no one in my regard for the cow. Hindus do not fulfil their trust so long as they do not possess the ability to protect the cow. That ability can be derived either from body-force or from soul-force. To attempt cow protection by violence is to reduce Hinduism to Satanism and to prostitute to a base end the grand significance of cow-protection. As a Mussalman friend writes, beef-eating which is merely permissible in Islam will become

a duty, if compulsion is resorted to by Hindus. The latter can protect the cow only by developing the faculty for dying, for suffering."[1]

The question of playing music before a mosque should be tackled in the same spirit of give and take. In each case it is no use quoting precedents and sitting tight over a right. The legitimate susceptibilities of the Muslim should be respected by the Hindus and of the Hindus should be respected by the Muslims.

The problem of conversion has also proved not a little knotty. Islam does not believe in compulsion in religion. The Prophet repudiates compulsion in religion: and the charge of forcible conversion to Islam cannot be proved against his followers as a body. There is a right method of conversion and there is a wrong method of conversion. "The real Shuddhi movement should consist in each one trying to arrive at perfection in his or her own faith. In such a faith, character would be the only test. What is the use of crossing from one compartment to another, if it does not mean a moral rise? What is the meaning of trying to convert to the service of God (for that must be the implication of Shuddhi or Tabligh) when those who are in my fold are everyday denying God by their actions ? 'Physician heal thyself' is more true in matters religious than mundane."[2] But while this is the ideal method, both the Hindus and the Muslims are free to conduct the conversion movement, if they think it is their bounden duty. In the name of free religious propaganda, preachers should be warned not to abuse other religions. It is the insidious propaganda which poisons the relations beteen the two communities.

In the same way, there is a legitimate type of Sangathan (organisation) and a false type. Physical culture movement is perfectly welcome. The *akhadas* (gymnasia)

as a means of fighting the other community will not do.

Lastly, there is the question of equitable distribution of loaves and fishes. Gandhi's policy here is to meet the Muslims as much as possible. The Muslim's claim for majority in Bengal and the Punjab should be admitted ungrudgingly by the Hindus. On the whole, his view is that the majority community has to placate the minority community. "So far as the political matters are concerned, as a non-co-operator, I am quite uninterested in them; but for the future understanding, I hold that it is up to the Hindus as the major party not to bargain but leave the pen in the hands of, say, Hakim Saheb Ajmal Khan, and abide by his decision. I would similarly deal with the Sikhs, the Christians, and the Parsis and be satisfied with the residue. It is, in my opinion, the only just, equitable, honourable, and dignified solution. Hindus, if they want unity among the different races, must have the courage to trust the minorities. Any other adjustment must leave a nasty taste in the mouth. Surely, the millions do not want to become legislators and municipal councillors...We want to do away with the communal spirit. The majority must, therefore, make the beginning and, thus, inspire the minorities with confidence in their bona fides. Adjustment is possible only when the more powerful take the initiative without waiting for response from the weaker."[1]

Gandhi, however, is opposed to the introduction of the communal principle, as far as possible, in the body politic. The services, at any rate, should be organised on the ground of efficiency alone. "So far as employment in the Government departments is concerned, I think it will be fatal to good government, if we introduce the communal spirit there. For administration to be efficient, it must always be in the hands of the fittest. There should certainly be no favouritism. But if we want five engi-

neers we must not take one from each community but we must take the fittest five even if they were all Mussalmans or all Parsis. The lowest posts must, if need be, be filled by examination by an impartial board consisting of men belonging to different communities. But distribution of posts should never be according to the proportion of the members of each community. The educationally backward communities will have a right to receive favoured treatment in the matter of education at the hands of national government. This can be secured in an effective manner. But those who aspire to occupy responsible posts in the government of the country, can only do so if they pass the required test."[1] The goal, at least, is clear: but, if necessary, some concessions to minority communities, of such a type as do not conflict with the progress of the nation towards its goal, may be allowed, as transitional expedients. "Our goal must be removal, at the earliest possible moment, of communal or sectional representation. A common electorate must impartially elect its representatives on the sole ground of merit. Our services must be likewise impartially manned by the most qualified men and women. But till that time comes and communal jealousy or preference becomes a thing of the past, minorities who suspect the motives of majorities must be allowed their way. The majorities must set the example of self-sacrifice."[2]

The root of the trouble is the mutual fear and distrust between the two communities. Let us face facts and try to get at the real mind of each community. It is a facile explanation that associates every evil with a foreign government. A foreign government must take advantage of the disunion. In some circumstances, it may even foment it. But the trouble is deeper than that. "The Mussalmans fear the Hindu majority because the Hindus, they say, have not always treated them with

justice, have not respected their religious prejudices, and because, they say, the Hindus are superior to them in education and wealth...The Hindus, on their part, fear the Mussalmans because they (the Hindus) say that Mussalmans, whenever they have held power, have treated them with great harshness and contend that though they were in a majority they were *non-plussed* by a handful of Mussalman invaders, that the danger of a repetition of the experience is ever present before the Hindus and that in spite of the sincerity of the leading Mussalmans, the Mussalman masses are bound to make common cause with any Mussalman adventurer."[1] The point is not whether these beliefs are justified, but whether they exist.

What is the way out? Many Hindus and many Muslims pin their faith on the foreign government and its machinery. The foreign government thus gets a certain moral right to exist in India. If this ground under the foreign Raj is to be taken away, it is necessary that a national outlook should gradually take the place of communal outlook. The suggestion made by Gandhi implies that a free self-governing India is the goal of all our political and social efforts: and this implies further that communalism must give way to nationalism. The Hindu-Muslim unity that Gandhi is trying to bring about is not to be a mere truce, based upon mutual fear: but a partnership between equals, each respecting the religion of the other. "The union that we want is not a patched-up thing, but a union of hearts, based upon a definite recognition of the indubitable proposition that Swaraj for India must be an impossible dream without an indissoluble union between the Hindus and the Muslims of India."[2]

The Indians must face the possibility of a free fight between the communities, without the interposition of a third power. Every free country tries to solve its own

domestic problems in its own way. The alternative to Hindu-Muslim unity is a perpetual slavery for both communities. Our troubles arise from the fact that we have lost the manliness to stand on our own feet. The fight for Swaraj cannot really even begin as long as both the Hindus and Mahommedans are not reconciled to the idea that anything is better than foreign domination. If force is to rule in India, let it be the internal force which emerges triumphant in a free fight in the country. "We do not yet clearly perceive that the possibility of a free fight between the two communities is a lesser evil than the existence of a foreign domination. And if it is the interposition of the British Government which keeps us from fighting one another, the sooner we are left free to fight, the better for our manhood, our respective religions, and our country. It will not be a new phenomenon if we fight ourselves into sanity."[1]

Internecine warfare is a better alternative than meek submission to any force, inside or outside. But non-violence is a superior weapon to either of them. It requires courage of the highest order, faith in ourselves, faith in the justice of our cause, faith in God and the ultimate goodness of human nature, and self-sacrifice at the altar of a cause. Warfare means that we entrust the safety of our cause to goondas (hooligans.) The Hindu is a coward, and the Muslim is a bully. Unless the Hindu sheds his cowardice, he cannot expect the Mussalman to respect him. It is not proper for him to take shelter behind the goondas of his community. "As things are going, each party will be the slave of their own goondas. This means dominance of the military power. England fought for the predominance of the civil power and won and lived. Lord Curzon did much harm to us. But he was certainly brave and right when he stood out for the predominance of civil authority, When Rome passed

into the hands of the soldiery, it fell. My whole soul rises against the very idea of the custody of my religion passing into the hands of goondas. Confining myself, therefore, to the Hindus, I must respectfully but earnestly warn the thinking Hindus against relying upon the assistance of goondas for the protection of their temples, themselves, and their wives and children. With the weak bodies they have, they must be determined to stand at their post and to die fighting or without fighting."[1]

Mutual toleration is not merely a political necessity during the time when we are trying to attain Swaraj: it is a necessity for all time. If peace between the two communities is to be more or less a permanent condition, it is necessary that both the communities should learn to respect each other's faiths, to avoid leaning upon the British executive or the judiciary, to avoid taking the law into their own hands and indulging in orgies of violence, and to organize the peaceful methods of settling all disputes. This is the meaning of non-violence in communal matters.

22. *THE PROBLEM OF UNTOUCHABILITY.*

Gandhi is out to fight injustice: and his whole non-violent campaign against the British is primarily motivated bythe desire to attain justice in India's relations with Britain. But he knows full well that the structure of the British Government does not rest so much upon its brute force as upon the social weaknesses of Indians themselves. The deep distrust between the two communities-the Hindus and the Muslims-is one of those weaknesses; the treatment of the lower classes by the high-caste Hindus is another fundamental weakness. The political parties which came before Gandhi had mainly directed our attention to the political problem of wresting power

from the British and differed to a certain extent as regard the methods. It was reserved for Gandhi to turn the searchlight inwards and insist that India must put her house in order, before she has a right to attack the British. Gandhi, however, was not a tame social reformer; but he realised fully that whether social reform preceded political reform or political reform preceded social reform, for India, progress meant simultaneous reform in both directions. Really and essentially, the whole movement for Swaraj meant for Gandhi the movement for reform within, for internal self-purification.

If the fight for Swaraj is a fight against injustice, it is up to the high-class Hindus to remove the blot of untouchability and be more decent and humane to their own co-religionists known as the Shudras. The Indians quarrel with the British for treating them as helots of the Empire: but why do they persist in treating their own co-religionists as helots ? There is the finger of God in this historical development. What right have the higher-caste Hindus to demand equal treatment at the hands of the British, when they refuse to give equal treatment to their own brethren in faith ? "Has not a just Nemesis overtaken us for the crime of untouchability ? Have we not reaped as we have sown ? Have we not practised Dyerism and O'Dwyerism on our own kith and kin ? We have segregated the 'pariah' and we are in turn segregated in the British Colonies ... Indeed, there is no charge that the 'pariah' cannot fling in our faces and which we do not fling in the faces of Englishmen."[1]

It is neither wisdom nor justice to leave out millions of men from the scheme of Swaraj. It is not justice because we have no right to grudge others, what we covet for ourselves. The Swaraj which Gandhi is trying to evolve is nothing but the realisation of his dream of social justice. Such a Swaraj cannot be obtained by violence: nor can it

be obtained by a mere transfer of power from the English to the Indians. We are guilty of having suppressed our brethren; we make them crawl on their bellies; we have made them rub their noses on the ground; with eyes red with rage, we push them out of railway compartments; what more than this has British rule done?...We ought to purge ourselves of this pollution. It is idle to talk of Swaraj so long as we do not protect the weak and the helpless or so long as it is possible for a single Swarajist to hurt the feelings of any individual. Swaraj means that not a single Hindu or Muslim shall for a moment arrogantly think that he can crush with impunity meek Hindus or Muslims. Unless this condition is fulfilled, we will gain Swaraj only to lose it the next moment."[1]

But here, as elsewhere, justice is not merely the highest ethics, but the best policy as well. The untouchables are a joint in the Hindu armour; there is always a danger of their joining hands with the reactionary forces in the country and supporting the Government. There is the possibility of wholesale conversions from the ranks of the Hindus. And from a still broader point of view, they are bound to be full of potential talent of all sorts, which requires to be drawn out in the best interests of the country.

There are three courses open to these down-trodden classes. " For their impatience they may call in the assistance of the slave-owning Government. They will get it, but they will fall from the frying pan into the fire. Today they are slaves of slaves. By seeking Government aid, they will be used for suppressing their kith, and instead of being sinned against, they will themselves be the sinners...Government aid is, therefore, no solution.

" The second is rejection of Hinduism and wholesale conversion to Islam or Christianity. And if a change

of religion can be justified for worldly betterment, I would advise it without hesitation. But religion is a matter of the heart: no physical inconvenience can warrant abandonment of one's own religion. If the inhuman treatment of the Panchamas were a part of Hinduism, its rejection would be a paramount duty both for them and for those like me who would not make a fetish even of religion and condone every evil in its sacred name. But I believe, untouchability is no part of Hinduism...Conversion, therefore, is no remedy whatever.

"Then there remains, finally, self-help and self-dependence."[1] These suppressed classes should take their fate into their own hands in the right way. They ought to make a determined effort to give up unclean ways of living, and vices like gambling or drinking. They should learn spinning and weaving and add to their income. They should not create more castes among themselves and look down upon their own brethren. They must not accept leavings from the plates of others. They can organise non-co-operation with the high-class Hindus, if they can: but otherwise it would be better for them to join the non-co-operation movement.

Untouchability is a blot on Hinduism. If there is sanction for this practice in Hinduism, Hinduism should be mended or ended. It is upto the Hindus to remove it root and branch. Mere sermons will not do. Gandhi did scavengering himself; Gandhi attended the meetings of these classes; Gandhi took the children of these depressed classes into his home. He has always identified himself with this class. "I do not want to be reborn. But if I have to be reborn, I should be born an untouchable, so that I may share their sorrows, sufferings, and the affronts levelled at them, in order that I may endeavour to free myself and them from that miserable condition."[2]

23. NATIONAL EDUCATION.

Education has been always recognised by national leaders to be a very important nation-building instrument. The existing system of education was considered denationalising by B. C. Pal and Lokamanya Tilak: and Gandhi continues the same tradition. His campaign against the Government schools and colleges was partly a protest against the Khilafat and Punjab wrongs: but it was partly more. Apart from its association with an unjust government, there are certain fundamental defects in it. "(1) It is based upon foreign culture to the almost entire exclusion of indigenous culture. (2) It ignores the culture of the heart and the hand, and confines itself solely to the head. (3) Real education is impossible through a foreign medium."[1]

The child is introduced to a culture absolutely different from his own, before he is made conscious of his own culture. The deeper he goes into it, the more out of harmony with his own environment he becomes. The result is that he learns to hate his own civilization as 'imbecile, barbarous, superstitious, and useless.' No wonder that he is torn from his own roots and becomes a foreigner in his own land of birth. He learns to be proud of English literature and English history, but feels humiliated by his own culture.

The present-day education in India is too literary in its scope and emphasis. The first thing which our young men need is an appreciation of the value of manual labour. The circumstances of the country demand that our boys should be fitted more for agricultural and industrial work than anything else. The country is too poor to afford the costly luxury of a literary education for the few at the expense of the vocational education for the many. If education has to be made universally accessible

to the poorest classes, it must be free and self-supporting.

Gandhi thinks, and thinks rightly, that the system of education to-day in India is becoming more and more mechanical. There is no transmission of life from the teacher to the taught. The teacher's profession–so much abused to-day–is the most sacred profession; it is for him to feel the great impulses which make a people great and inspire these among the students.

The medium of instruction to-day, in secondary and higher education, is foreign. "The foreign medium has caused brain-fag, put an undue strain upon the nerves of our children, made them crammers and imitators, unfitted them for original work and thought, and disabled them for filtrating their learning to the family or the masses. The foreign medium has made our children practically foreigners in their own land. It is the greatest tragedy of the existing system. The foreign medium has prevented the growth of our vernaculars."[1]

In all this there is no objection to the study of English as a great language, but to its use as a vehicle of instruction. The English language is very valuable because it contains some of the richest treasures of thought and literature, and because it is the language of international commerce and diplomacy. But the English language cannot take the place of the mother-tongue of the people, without destroying the people's individuality. It can never be the language of the masses. Its worship as the *sine qua non* of higher education has given a false turn to our whole system of education. "Among the many evils of foreign rule this blighting imposition of a foreign medium upon the youth of the country will be counted by history as one of the greatest. It has sapped the energy of the nation; it has shortened the lives of the pupils; it has estranged them from the masses; it has

made education unnecessarily expensive. If this process is still persisted in, it bids fair to rob the nation of its soul."[1]

The attempt to anglicise Indians cannot but cause sincere misgivings among all honest patriots. It has given us a caste of English-educated persons who cannot share their thoughts often with persons of their own family and always with the masses of our countrymen. The wives have, thus, been unable to be partners of their husbands. Parents have been unable to understand the minds of their children. The few intellectuals, who hail from new Universities every year, have failed to touch the mind of the people. Doctors cannot argue intelligently with their patients. The addresses of the counsels and the learned discourses of the judges remain inaccessible to the public. This state of things must end.

It is difficult to say what a colossal waste of intelligence is implied in this unnatural process. The earliest and the best years of a child's life are wasted in mastering a foreign tongue. The result is that the educated people are losing their vitality fast. The capacity of imitation has prospered at the expense of true creativeness. It is not that the Indians are by nature crammers and imitators. If to-day, they have hardly one genius to show against ten or twenty in other countries, in almost every field of thought, it is due not to any faults inherent in the Indian brain, but is due entirely to the existing system which puts an extraordinary premium upon a knowledge of a foreign language and sacrifices everything at its altar.

A new system of education is needed to create a new world. Gandhi does not suggest that we must go back to the medieval system and shut out all foreign ideas. Nothing is more remote from his thought. It is perfectly true that he concentrates more on the defects of the system than on its merits: and he over-emphasises certain

aspects of education more than perhaps apparently necessary. Such is the case, for example, with foreign culture. Such is the case with education in sciences. But to do him justice, he is not blind to the necessity of modernising the educational system: but in trying to modernise our system, we must not lose sight of the fundamental needs of Indian life to-day. To nationalise education in India means to bring it into line with the basic requirements of the situation in India. "The greatest drawback of the present system of education is that it does not bear the stamp of reality, that the children do not react to the varying wants of the country. True education must correspond to the surrounding circumstances or it is not a healthy growth. The necessity of this response was the object of Non-co-operation in education."[1]

It appears that educational institutions which embody Gandhian ideals are as much one-sided as the institutions he criticises. His emphasis on the teaching of arts and crafts as a means of making the education of our children more practical, of making it more self-supporting, appears fantastic to many. But it is not more grotesque than the way in which we make our boys murder the finest part of their time and intelligence at the altar of a study which has no earthly relationship with the realities of Indian life. The thing is that the Government overshadows everything in India and the lure of Government service is the greatest of lures. Naturally, the type of educational qualification which the Government recognises is recognised elsewhere: and the values thus created which are essentially artificial, appear perfectly natural to Indians to-day. Gandhi, therefore, gives us a scheme which in its main ideas is more based on realities than any scheme in operation to-day. Dignity of manual labour is what we ought to recognise more than the study of a foreign language. The training of hands is of

greater importance to the country than a smattering of foreign culture. Education should not be a costly luxury confined to a few: it should be rendered accessible to all. It should give us honest, hardworking men and women, who are ready to live and die for their country, rather than a few "*saheb logs*" who dress in an English style and talk in the English language and look down upon the average man in the street. Is not Gandhi right in saying that unless we go through the fire of non-co-operation, we will never recover our elemental sense of reality, we will never cease to look at life through the false spectacles of English education? "But this is not to say that our educational institutions must become mere spinning and weaving institutes. Like a skilled physician, I tend and concentrate my attention on the diseased limb, knowing that that is the best way of looking after the others. I would develop in the child, his hands, his brain, and his soul. The hands have almost atrophied. The soul has been altogether ignored. I, therefore, put in a plea, in season and out of season, for correcting these grave defects in our education...I value education in the different sciences. Our children cannot have too much of chemistry and physics."[1]

India has a mission in the world to-day. That mission is first to be herself and then to contribute her share to the solution of the world's problems. The whole point behind national education is that India should be fitted to play her part well in the struggle of humanity for a better life. To be herself India must be faithful to her own culture. India has a culture of her own, a culture of which she may be justly proud. She has also to build a new culture, suited to her genius and conditions to-day. Foreign culture can supplement our culture: but it cannot take its place. "Nothing can be further from my thought than that we should become exclusive, or erect barriers. But I do respectfully contend that an appreci-

ation of other cultures can fitfully follow, never precede, an appreciation and assimilation of our own. It is my firm opinion that no culture has treasures so rich as ours. We have not known it, we have been made even to deprecate its study and depreciate its value. We have almost ceased to live it."[1]

There is no idea of a revival here: but the idea of fitting India for her specific task in a way suited to her situation. The central idea in Gandhi's scheme, therefore, is that Indian culture should occupy the main place in our scheme of education: and Indian culture means not only Hindu culture or Islamic culture, but a synthesis of cultures made up of Hindu, Islamic and other cultures. "The National University holds that a systematic study of Asiatic cultures is no less essential than the study of Western sciences for a complete education for life. The vast treasures of Sanskrit and Arabic, Persian and Pali and Magadhi, have to be ransacked in order to discover wherein lies the source of strength for the nation. It does not propose merely to feed on, or repeat, the ancient cultures. It rather hopes to build a new culture based on the traditions of the past enriched by the experience of later times. It stands for the synthesis of the different cultures that have come to stay in India, that have influenced Indian life, and that, in their turn, have been influenced by the spirit of the soil. This synthesis will naturally be the Swadeshi type where each culture is assured its legitimate place, and not of American pattern, where one dominant culture absorbs the rest, and where the aim is not towards harmony, but towards an artificial and forced unity."[2]

The objectives of the Government system of education are radically different. Macaulay had dreamt that the spread of English education will result in the Christianization of India. "It is my firm belief," he wrote, "that if

our plans of education are followed up, there will not be a single idolater among the respectable classes of Bengal thirty years hence."[1] Another idea behind the system was more practical: and it has borne fruit. The idea was to turn out clerks and officers for Government subordinate services. Gandhi wants Indians to change their whole angle of vision and look to the service of the country as their end in life, instead of the service of a foreign Government. The mania for careers and degrees of the universities must go. "There is one big obstacle in our path. We are enamoured of 'degrees'. The very life seems to hang upon passing an examination and obtaining a degree. It sucks the nation's life-blood. We forget that 'degrees' are required only by candidates for Government service. But Government service is not a foundation of national life."[2]

The Government system of education is top-heavy. It aims at creating a caste of anglicised intellectuals, who are to be pale replicas of the English Sahebs. Europe-returned graduates are to be, therefore, preferred for higher services to pure Indian products. England-returned students are to have superior claims to the mere Europe-returned. And those who have Oxford or Cambridge degrees are to form the very elite of the whole lot. Naturally, sons of high Government officials, landlords, merchants and such other moneyed classes can go there for higher studies. These then become the controllers of India's policy along with a few Englishmen. The average man has no say in the business. The man from the artisan or agricultural class does not count at all. A superficial veneer of Europe's culture is the one passport to the highest posts in India. Such has been the tendency of our educational policy for the last hundred years.

It is no wonder that Gandhi's plain home truths are laughed out of court by this caste. But Gandhi has a

better grip of Indian situation than all these pundits put together. Indian truth must spring from Indian soil. It is pure Indian needs which must shape India's policy. The Indian representatives of our educational policy are often Indians only in name. They are a species of hybrids, incapable of understanding elementary truths about India. Gandhi's voice here also is the voice of a revolutionary: he wants wisdom to come down from Heaven to earth, from a few spoiled half-educated Indian Oxens and Cantabs to the masses. The tiller of the soil, the mechanic, the small craftsman, the man in the street should have a decisive voice in the shaping of our educational policy for the country as a whole. How can the pundits of Oxford and Cambridge understand the essential needs of the masses of India? These pundits must unlearn much, must mix with the people, must lose themselves in the herd before they can understand what the people really need. The spinning-wheel is nearer to India's soul to-day than Shakespeare. Tulsidas is sure to draw out the music in our people much better than Tennyson and Browning.

Education, like other subjects, requires interpretation in terms of the basic needs of the masses in our country. But this cannot be done as long as we hang upon Government for everything. This servile dependence upon Government for the initiation of vital policies for our country leads us nowhere. The Government is not interested in taking this view-point; it is, therefere, incapable of understanding it. People must, therefore, take the initiative themselves. Education cannot be national in any sense of the term as long as it is not controlled by the genuine representatives of the people. Hitherto the representatives of the people have, on the whole, taken their initiative, their guidance from the Government. This must change. The whole effort of the nationalist in India from the time of Tilak is in the direction of emanci-

pating our mind from this hypnotism. It has been a very slow and arduous affair. But there is no doubt that the country can never be free, that it can never progress on right lines till it assimilates this important truth.

There may be differences of opinion as regards details; but this point of view must tell. We need sciences. We need technology. We need history and economics, sociology and philosophy. No one doubts it. But we must assimilate them: they must not assimilate us. We must master foreign culture and make it subservient to our national needs; at present it is the reverse. Gandhi, therefore, concentrates on the problem of national language. The fundamental characteristic of the system to-day is that it is English in character, English in form, English in everything. It is called English education. It must cease to be English education and become Indian education. It cannot be Indian education till it expresses the Indian soul in Indian language to Indian hearts. The question of medium, therefore, becomes all-important to us.

India needs an all-India language. Even if an all-India language is not an indispensable necessity for the Indian nationality, it is a very important condition. Should English permanently be such a *lingua franca* for the whole of India ? Gandhi's answer is clear. A national language should fulfil five conditions. It should be easy to learn for the official class. It should be a medium for the religious, commercial, and political activity throughout India. It should be the speech of the majority of the inhabitants of India. It should be easy to learn for the whole of the country. It should be capable of being useful not for a few years only but for a very long period.

English does not fulfil any of these conditions. The number of Indian officials will go on increasing in the

Indian public service and for them English is a foreign language and, therefore, difficult to learn. For purposes of politics or commerce or religious propaganda, English can never be a really efficient medium : because the masses will never pick it up. The nation has materially suffered for all these years, inasmuch as the proceedings of the Indian National Congress were conducted in it. For nearly hundred and fifty years the British administration is there: and yet the English has failed to become the language of the masses. The very idea that English should be our national language is ridiculous, unless India thinks that she will realise her destiny only as a part of Britain and her Empire permanently. The Liberals think of India often as a permanent part of the Empire and, therefore, they think that the more we imbibe the form as well as the content of the English civilisation, the nearer we shall be to our goal. Raja Ram Mohun Roy was the first great Indian Liberal, and he looked forward to the prospect of India becoming one day an English-speaking country. But since 1905, India has begun to realise the colossal absurdity of this idea.

The question at issue behind the language problem is : does India want to be herself at all or does she contemplate the dream of becoming a province of Great Britain ? To-day she is not even a province of Great Britain : but she aspires to be a province so far as the imagination of some Indian Liberals goes. Here Gandhi is iconoclastic to the core. To him the problem of cultural autonomy is bound up with the problem of linguistic autonomy. Gandhi, however, wants to retain one all-India language and insists that Hindi should take the place of English as such a language.

A few decades of English education have blinded us to the possibilities of our own languages. An illusion has grown up in certain quarters that India will go back

to medieval darkness and barbarism, that she will lose her zest for the ideals of freedom and patriotism, of science and civilisation, if she allows English language to go under. This illusion is one of the roots from which our mental slavery springs. Unless this root is destroyed, a healthy nationalism cannot blossom in India. English may be a language of freedom for Englishmen: for Indians it is a symbol of slavery and degradation. The superstitious reverence for English language, English literature, is at the root of our present helpless condition. English, under no circumstances, should be allowed to be our national language, to usurp the dearest place in our heart and take the place of our mother-tongues. This infatuation for English is the outcome of our unnatural relations with England. "The highest development of the Indian mind must be possible without a knowledge of English. It is doing violence to the manhood and specially the womanhood of India to encourage our boys and girls to think that an entry into the best society is impossible without a knowledge of English. It is too humiliating a thought to be bearable. To get rid of the infatuation of English is one of the essential conditions of Swaraj."[1]

We are again and again told that men like Tilak and Gandhi are the products of the present system of education and asked in triumphant tones as to where we would have been but for the present system of education? Gandhian campaign aims at destroying the basis of the present system. The British Government has not only captured the body of India but also her soul. This is the greatest tragedy of the present system. Slavery reaches its climax when the slave hugs the chains to his bosom. If Gandhi does not care to point out the good in the system, it is because he is up against the mental disease from which India's helplessness comes. He, therefore, will not have it half-way. "The system of education is

an unmitigated evil. I put my best energy to destroy that system. The advantages, we have so far got, are in spite of the system, not because of the system. Supposing the English were not here, India would have marched with other parts of the world...Tilak and Ram Mohan would have been far greater men if they had not had the contagion of English learning...Ram Mohan and Tilak... were so many pigmies who had no hold upon the people compared with Chaitanya, Shankar, Kabir and Nanak... What Shanker was able to do, the whole army of English-knowing men can't do. I can multiply instances. Was Guru Govind a product of English education ? "[1]

The soul of a nation lies in its literature. The literature of India means the literature of her vernaculars. These vernaculars will not blossom as long as the spell of English literature and education is upon the best of the Indians. In the cultural history of India, there is no sadder chapter than the gradual withering of vernaculars under the blighting influence of English. It is no use saying that the vernaculars are not capable of doing justice to modern thought. "There never was a greater superstition than that a particular language can be incapable of expression or expressing abstruse or scientific ideas. A language is an exact reflection of the character and growth of its speakers."[2] The vernaculars should be the media of instruction: Hindi should be the national language of India; while English may remain the language of commerce and diplomacy, of international intercourse, of the Empire, and of Western culture and thought for a few intellectuals.

24. *ECONOMIC REFORM.*

Economic reconstruction appears to Gandhi a fundamental part of the general social reconstruction of

India. But it is characteristic of him to subordinate economics to ethics. The economic values have weight with him, but they are not allowed to dominate human life. Man is not a mere economic animal: but economics are a part of his life. Wealth means to him the real well-being. "I must confess that I do not draw a sharp line or any distinction between economics and ethics. Economics that hurt the moral well-being of an individual or a nation are immoral and, therefore, sinful. Thus the economics that permit one country to prey upon another are immoral. It is sinful to buy and use articles made by sweated labour. It is sinful to eat American wheat and let my neighbour the grain-dealer starve for want of custom."[1]

Such is the main position of Gandhi in his economics. He does not bother about the classical economic thinking of the West: but his sense of reality does not really mislead him. The usual economic criteria, in so far as they conflict with deeper considerations, do not appeal to him. The Indian economists have criticised him *ad nauseam*: but all this criticism has left him cold. Gandhi is not a man of books: he does not derive his knowledge from the usual authorities on the subject. But Gandhi's propositions deserve greater attention on that account: because in him we do not usually find a mere repetition of what others have said. He has novel insights of very great importance to offer in every field of Indian thought: and his economics are not an exception to it.

The starting-point of Gandhi's study of India is a village. This is another great insight of Gandhi. Economists before his time had repeated again and again that India is a country of villages; but it was reserved for Gandhi to make this position the basis of his economics about India. Men like Radhakamal Mookerjee had seen this very clearly: but no great school of Indian politics

had made much use of this insight. The realisation of the fact that India really means her seven hundred thousand villages, her overwhelming population of peasants and mechanics, constitutes the centre of Gandhi's thinking about India.

The reconstruction of India meant to Gandhi, therefore, the reconstruction of Indian villages. This idea expressed itself in the form of an organisation in 1934: but it was implied in all his thinking from the very beginning. The Association concentrates its attention on sanitation, food reform, and, above all, the economic life of the villages.

India need not, India ought not to go in for a blind worship of material things. Material prosperity of the West does not dazzle Gandhi: and he does not want India to make a mad plunge for it. Material prosperity, far from bringing moral prosperity in its train, often spells ruin for it. "Rome suffered a moral fall when it attained high material affluence. So did Egypt and so perhaps most countries of which we have any any historical record. The descendants and kinsmen of the royal divine Krishna too fell when they were rolling in riches."[1] Gandhi seriously maintains that the scriptures of the world are sounder treatises on the laws of economics than the text-books of to-day. His economics are the economics of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the greatest economist of all times. The rich man is asked to give all that he has to the poor: because it if easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God. No one can serve both God and Mammon : hence India too must make up her mind whether she will go for God or Mammon. The western nations have so far practised the worship of the almighty Dollar. The whole tendency of Indian culture is different. Her goal is the attainment not of material prosperity but

of moral supremacy in the world. She cannot have both. She cannot avoid America's methods, if she wants to achieve America's wealth. "It is not possible to conceive gods inhabiting a land, which is made hideous by the smoke and the din of mill chimneys and factories and whose roads are traversed by rushing engines, dragging numerous cars crowded with men, who know not for the most part what they are after, who are often absent-minded, and whose tempers do not improve by being uncomfortably packed like sardines in boxes."[1] Let us seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and everything else will be added to us. These are real economics for Gandhi.

It will now be clear why Gandhi is a persistent opponent of the worship of the machine. Industrialisation of India means the wholesale adoption of the Western methods of production. But Gandhi would rather see India poor, then see her getting rich in the usual way of mass production. The objection to the use of machinery sometimes springs from the Swadeshi spirit, the desire to protect India from an invasion of cheap manufactured articles from the West: but really it is deeper than that. Gandhi's reasoning is that if there had been no machines, no use of steam and electricity, no large-scale production, there would not have been the wholesale exploitation of labour by capital, of poorer countries like India by capitalist nations of the West, no unhealthy social life which disfigures the big cities of Europe and America. His test is the same: does this multiplication of production by modern machinery make for the simplicity, innocence, harmony, beauty, dignity, and elevation of our life? Do we become better men and women in these days? In his "Indian Home Rule" his answer is simple and clear. "Machinery has begun to desolate Europe. Ruination is now knocking at the English gates. Machinery is the chief symbol of modern

civilisation; it represents a great sin.

"The workers in the mills of Bombay have become slaves. The condition of the women in the mills is shocking. When there were no mills, these women were not starving. If the machinery craze goes in our country, it will become an unhappy land. It may be considered a heresy, but I am bound to say that it were better for us to send money to Manchester and to use flimsy Manchester cloth than to multiply mills in India. By using Manchester cloth we would only waste our money, but by reproducing Manchester in India we shall keep our money at the price of our blood, because our very moral being will be sapped, and I call in support of my statement the very mill-hands as witnesses......It is necessary to realise that machinery is bad. If instead of welcoming machinery as a boon, we would look upon it as an evil, it would ultimately go."[1]

But this does not mean that Gandhi is opposed to all machinery. He will welcome such machinery as will increase the real happiness and lighten the labour of humanity. It is the use that is made of machinery that really shocks him, not the machinery itself. "I am against its indiscriminate multiplication. I refuse to be dazzled by the seeming triumph of machinery. I am uncompromisingly against all destructive machinery. But simple tools and instruments and such machinery as saves individual labour and lightens the burden of the millions of cottagers I should welcome."[2] Machinery should be the servant of humanity, not its master, its friend not its foe. "Machinery has its place, it has come to stay. But it must not be allowed to displace necessary human labour. An improved plough is a good thing. But if by some chance one man could plough up by some mechanical invention of his the whole of the land of India and control all the agricultural produce and if the millions have no other occupation, they would starve, and being idle, they would

become dunces, as many have already become."[1]

Industrialism is unhealthy because it makes slaves of vast masses of men. The concentration of wealth in a few hands, and the tremendous power they acquire over the destinies of the vast majority of men are obviously undesirable. If we are told, there is no other way of improving our material condition and becoming rich, Gandhi will have nothing to do with such wealth. Capitalism makes an alliance with Imperialism, and we will have to fight both. "It would be folly to assume that an Indian Rockfeller would be better than the American Rockfeller. Impoverished India can become free but it will be hard for an India made rich through immorality, to regain its freedom. I fear we will have to admit that moneyed men support British rule: their interest is bound up with its stability."[2]

But we must not fly from one evil to another. Capitalism is bad: but the fight to destroy it may be equally bad. Gandhi is neither a capitalist nor a communist. He wants a new social organisation to gradually emerge from the present chaos. It ought to be a return to absolute simplicity based on Dharma-the idea of justice. " The relations between mill-agents and mill hands ought to be one of father and children or as between blood-brothers... Our ideal demands that all our power, all our wealth, and all our brains should be devoted solely to the welfare of those, who through their own ignorance and our false notions of things, are styled labourers or ' servants.' What I expect of you, therefore, is that you should hold all your riches as a trust to be used solely in the interests of those who sweat for you, and to whose industry and labour you owe all your position and prosperity. I want you to make your labourers co-partners of your wealth. I do not mean to suggest that unless you legally bind yourselves to do all that, there should be a labour insurrection. The

only sanction I can think of in this connection is of mutual love and regard as between father and son, not of law. If only you make it a rule to respect these mutual obligations of love, there would be an end to all labour disputes......From the moment your men come to realise that the mills are theirs, no less than yours, they will begin to feel towards you as blood-brothers, there would be no question of their acting against the common interest."[1]

Gandhi's distrust of machinery and capitalistic methods of production and distribution mainly arises from his study of Indian conditions. Gandhian economics are dominated by two factors: his firm conviction that the highest values are moral and spiritual and the whole economic civilisation should be subordinated to them and his strong conviction that circumstances alter cases and, therefore, Indian problems should be tackled in the light of Indian conditions and Indian experience. The latter conviction is not peculiar to him: but his interpretation of Indian conditions is characteristic of him. The greatest danger we must guard here as elsewhere is the tendency to mechanical imitation of Western forms. Nothing is likely to be more disastrous than that. We " must not be entrapped by false analogies. European writers are handicapped for want of experience and accurate information. They cannot guide us beyond a certain measure, if they have to generalise from European examples which cannot be on all fours with Indian conditions, because in Europe they have nothing like the conditions of India, not even excluding Russia. What may be true of Europe is not necessarily true of India. We know, too, that each nation has its own characteristics and individuality. India has her own, and if we are to find out a true solution for her many ills, we shall have to take all the idiosyncrasies of her constitution into account, and then prescribe a remedy. I claim that to industrialise

India in the same sense as Europe, is to attempt the impossible."[1]

What then is the fundamental economic problem of India ? It is the poverty of the masses. Here Gandhi lays the same stress on the root weakness of India as did Dadabhai, R. C. Dutt or Digby. The fact of India's poverty does not require demonstration. It is self-evident. He who runs may read it. The sophistications of some economists, who will deduce India's prosperity from statistics, leave him cold. It is also a lie to say that India is full of buried aud hoarded gold. "Throughout my wanderings in India I have rarely seen a buoyant face. The middle classes are groaning under the weight of awful distress. For the lowest order there is no hope. They do not know a bright day...If the gods were to come down and testify otherwise, I would insist on saying that I see India growing poorer."[2]

The starvation of the masses is the main fact about India. India need not be rich as Europe and America are. She can afford to do without millionaires and multi-millionaires. But she cannot allow hundreds and thousands of her children to grow up without decent means of sustenance. Gandhi wants above all to fight this poverty and starvation. He accepts the analysis of the Liberal economists of India as regards the causes of Indian poverty. Excessive military expenditure, drain, and a commercial policy suited to England's interest, these are the foremost causes of the progressive impoverishment of India. In the economic sphere, Gandhi wants India to do all she can to remove this poverty by ways which are available to her independently of the Government. A glance at the economic history of India has convinced him that India is primarily an agricultural country, with a few great and small industries suited to her. Among them the cloth industry has always been the greatest industry of India,

next to her agriculture. This industry died an unnatural death in the nineteenth century. " The Lancashire cloth, as English historians have shown, was forced upon India, and her own world manufactures were deliberately and systematically ruined. India is, therefore, at the mercy not only of Lancashire but also of Japan, France, and America. Just see what this has meant to India. We grow enough cotton for our own cloth. Is it not madness to send cotton outside India, and have it manufactured into cloth there and shipped to us? Was it right to reduce India to such a helpless state?

" A hundred and fifty years ago, we manufactured all our cloth. Our women spun fine yarn in their own cottages, and supplemented the earnings of their husbands. The village weavers wove that yarn. It was an indispensable part of national economy in a vast agricultural country like ours."[1]

The nation, therefore, should see that India becomes once more a prosperous country. The key to that economic prosperity lies in well-balanced production, suited to country's needs and capacities. In the present circumstances of India, the importation of cheap manufactured articles from foreign countries is one of the chief obstacles to Indian economic development. If this is done in the name of free trade, Gandhi is opposed to it. "The fact is, that I am a confirmed protectionist. Free trade may be good for England which dumps down her manufactures among helpless people and wishes her wants to be supplied from outside at the cheapest rate. But free trade has ruined India's peasantry, in that it has all but destroyed her cottage industry. Moreover, no new trade can compete with foreign trade without protection. Natal nursed her sugar industry by both bounty and import duty. Germany developed beet sugar by a system of bounties. I would any day welcome protection for mill industry...Indeed, I

would give protection to all useful industries."[1]

A policy of all-round protection, suited to India, is out of the question, as long as India has no control over her economic policy. India, therefore, has always turned to the two usual weapons available to a dependent country, Swadeshi and Boycott. The weapon of boycott takes many forms-the boycott of all foreign goods, the boycott of British goods, the boycott of Empire goods, the boycott of foreign cloth, the boycott of British cloth, or the boycott of selected foreign or British articles. On the whole, Gandhi here will prefer to follow the Liberal tradition against boycotts. The general objection to boycotts is that there is hatred and violence behind them. There are, however, occasions when the nation cannot show its resentment effectively in any other way. The nation has every right to resort to it in such circumstances and it is sure to be a formidable weapon, if it can be properly enforced. But apart from the ethical objection to these boycotts, we find that they are generally ineffective. We can succeed " if we have the will, the courage, and opportunity to regulate the boycott by armed force, by creating an army of open revolutionaries, by forcing for that specific purpose a strike of dock labourers and others connected with the handling of British goods. I hold, therefore, that it will be more consistent with national dignity, prestige, and welfare to give up the cry, proved to be useless, and almost impossible, of boycott of British goods."[2]

Such boycotts are supposed to have spectacular value. They are meant to be weapons of retaliation either for specific wrongs or for general wrongs. They are, therefore, not primarily economic in character. Their object is to hurt our adversary, rather than to help ourselves. They cannot be a part of a non-violent campaign. The word 'British' shows that we intend to discriminate. The

facts which militate against the success of such a boycott must be calmly examined and squarely faced. We must not make ourselves ridiculous by passing resolutions which have no solidity behind. They inflame the British people, but they cannot even injure them. They are doubly wrong: they are morally culpable and materially impracticable. In the first place, we depend upon British goods for some of our national requirements. We cannot do without English books or English medicines: how then can we expect the importer of British watches to sacrifice his trade? Secondly, it involves sacrifice of their millions by millionaires. This is obviously difficult. Thirdly, the bulk of the Empire goods, like railway materials, is imported by Government or English firms and some trifles like soaps and scents by the luxurious classes, who do not generally care for these boycotts. To be effective, such a boycott must be taken up by the whole country at once. "It is like a siege. You can carry out a siege only when you have the requisite men and instruments of destruction. One man scratching a wall with his finger nails may hurt his fingers but will produce no effect upon the walls."[1]

The fundamental objection to the boycott of British goods, or Empire goods, or British cloth, from Gandhi's point of view, is that it thrives upon and contributes to the creation of a mentality which he is out to combat and fight. A boycott has a perfectly legitimate place in a campaign of armed rebellion or in a campaign preparatory for armed rebellion. It is based upon violence and creates violence. It is, therefore, opposed to the whole spirit of Gandhi's philosophy and practice. It weakens his movement by associating it with something destructive of its essential idea. " The motive of boycott being positive lacks the inherent practicability of Non-co-operation. The spirit of punishment is a sign of weak-

ness. A strengthening of that spirit will retard the process of regeneration...Above all, if India has a mission of her own, she will not fulfil it by copying the doubtful example of the West and making her sacrifice materialistically utilitarian instead of offering a sacrifice spotless and pleasing even in the sight of God."[1] There is a world of difference between boycott of things British and Non-co-operation with the British Government, although they appear to be similar. Non-co-operation is primarily directed against our own weaknesses and is meant to bring about a change of heart in the authorities by sheer pressure of love and sacrifice. Boycott is meant primarily to harm the British and, therefore, likely to create a permanent gulf between the Indians and the British. Non-co-operation, therefore, is as different from boycott 'as an elephant from an ass.'

The boycott of foreign cloth is, however, a permanent necessity of all time. There is no racial bias here. It is contrived with a view to shut out an article from the Indian market, which is likely to hinder the full development of a great industry suited to India. It operates like the policy of protection adopted by various Governments of the world to-day. Gandhi believes in the artificial closing of the national market under certain circumstances. The welfare of India alone should be consulted in regarding her imports or exports. Gandhi does not believe in the unrestrained play of demand and supply, in the name of freedom of competition and trade. "I do not endorse the proposition that supply follows demand. On the other hand, demand is often artificially created by unscrupulous vendors. And if a nation is bound, as I hold it is, then it must consider the welfare of those whose wants it seeks to supply. It is wrong and immoral for a nation to supply, for instance, intoxicating liquor to those who are addicted to drink. What is true of intoxi-

cants is true of grain or cloth, if the discontinuation of their cultivation or manufacture in the country to which foreign grain or cloth are exported, results in enforced idleness or penury. These latter hurt a man's soul and body just as much as intoxication...It is then I hold the duty of Great Britain to regulate her exports with due regard to the welfare of India, as it is India's to regulate her imports with due regard to her own welfare."[1]

Swadeshi then remains the one time-honoured weapon in India's armoury. In the broad sense it means an intelligent devotion to one's own country, nation, culture. "Swadeshi is that spirit in us which restricts us to the use and service of our immediate surroundings to the exclusion of the more remote. Thus, as for religion, in order to satisfy the requirements of the definition, I must restrict myself to my ancestral religion. That is the use of my immediate religious surrounding. If I find it defective I should serve it by purging it of its defects. In the domain of politics I should make use of the indigenous institutions and serve them by curing them of their proved defects. In that of economics, I should use only things that are produced by my immediate neighbours and serve those industries by making them efficient and complete where they be found wanting."[2]

In the economic sphere, Gandhi's ideal is that of national self-sufficiency. "If not an article of commerce had been brought from outside India, she would be to-day a land flowing with milk and honey."[3] But granting that this ideal is impracticable under the present circumstances, we can certainly try to shut out all articles which we can produce well at home, either by a tariff wall or by the practice of rigid Swadeshi in these matters. The ideal patriot will use only articles produced in the country and will learn to do without those things which the country cannot or does not produce. If we cannot produce even

pins or needles, we must learn to do without them. But at any rate, we ought not to import articles from outside India, which are produced or capable of being produced in the country. If this cult becomes universal India will be a series of villages, each of which will be "a self-supporting and self-contained unit, exchanging only such necessary commodities with other villages, where they are not locally producible."[1]

Swadeshi understood in this sense means a practice of simplicity and sacrifice. It is a religious principle, a religious discipline. It is, therefore, an integral part of the campaign of Non-co-operation. "Non-co-operation is nothing but discipline in self-sacrifice. And I believe that a nation that is capable of limitless sacrifice, is capable of rising to limitless heights. The purer the sacrifice, the quicker the progress. Swadeshi offers every man, woman, and child an occasion to make a beginning in self-sacrifice of a pure type ..It will be a striking demonstration of national solidarity."[2] Swadeshi, however, will stay when many other parts of Gandhi's programme may go. It is not merely a part of the effort to win Swaraj: it is a permanent part of the national programme for all time, because it is a necessity of national existence.

There is nothing racial or particular about the gospel of Swadeshi. To follow Swadeshi is to obey the law of our being. There is no idea here to punish the foreigner. There is merely the desire to regulate the life of the nation with a view to its essential requirements. The cult of Swadeshi is not the cult of organised selfishness. It is the cult of healthy patriotism. It is the service of the nation and the service of humanity through the service of the nation. "My patriotism is both exclusive and inclusive. It is exclusive in the sense that in all humility I confine my attention to the land of my birth. But it is

inclusive in the sense that my service is not of a competitive or antagonistic nature."[1]

Gandhi, however, strikes out a new line when he defines the exact nature of the type of Swadeshi India most badly needs at this moment. To him Swadeshi does not mean the establishment of more factories and more mechanised production. It means intensive concentration on Indian cloth industry and above all reversion to pre-British days of hand-spinning and hand-weaving. This is the sum and substance of his Indian economics. The hand-spun, known as Khadi, has become the outer symbol of Gandhism. Gandhism has come to be associated with hand-spun cotton and hand-spun white khaddar caps, as Mussolini's movement is associated with black shirts. To him Khadi has a mystic significance : and the one topic to which he reverts again and again, next to non-violence, is Khadi.

The Gandhian economics and to a great extent, his social philosophy, centre round the Charkha (the hand-spinning machine). The Charkha is to be the panacea of all our ills in India. It is the wheel of life. It is Kama-dhenu, the wish-fulfilling cow. It is the beloved Sita, after whom Gandhi wanders to deliver her from the ten-headed monster, from Japan, Manchester etc. He is Charkha-mad. He sees the wheel in the Gita and the Scriptures. He sees in it a means to his personal salvation, because of his faith, sincerity, and concentration. The following enthusiastic account of the work of the Charkha by a disciple of Gandhi clearly sums up all that the Charkha stands for in his imagination and belief.

"I am a simple thing and anybody can understand my mechanism. I can be bought for a rupee or two. I am portable and easily accessible to all. I am much lighter than the grinding stone, therefore, I am most popular with

the fair sex. I am in demand at the time of marriages. My production satisfies the religious want of the pundits because I am always sacred. I can give bread to the millions of starving villagers of India, can clothe the farmers, can give a livelihood to beggars, can give a dignified profession to the fallen sisters and those whose modesty is otherwise exposed to the assaults of hateful persons. I am in the habit of demolishing 'devil's workshops' by keeping busy all idle men's minds, if they care to turn to me. I feed the weavers, the carders, the iron-smiths, and tbe carpenters. I can save the heavy drainage of India that has been sapping her very life-blood. I can effect real unity between the different communities of India by making them interdependent. I can ameliorate the conditions of the untouchables by making it easy to find a market for the yarn produced by them. I can establish real peace in India by teaching its inhabitants self-respect and self-reliance and thus render it absolutely impossible for other nations to come to India with the idea of exploiting her. I can introduce simplicity in life and make the opulent condescend to talk with the mill-hands. I can destroy the pride of the capitalist by abolishing the factory system and thus putting an end to the ever multiplying miseries of the labourers, and by being a menace to ambition and love of aggrandisement. I am thus a harbinger of peace and restorer of financial health to India and impartial distributor of wealth."[1]

The economic problem of India is the problem of giving to her vast masses suitable employment. Agriculture cannot fully occupy all the hands: and there is already too much pressure on the soil. Economists suggest that the growth of industry is the only way out. What industry is most suitable for this purpose? The two essential and universal necessities are food and clothing. Cloth-production, therefore, is to be the second great in-

dustry of India. India is one of the great cotton-growing countries of the world. India has a great tradition in the textile industry. In every way it is an industry best suited to India. It is a sin to export raw material when we can manufacture it at home. It is a sin to import foreign cloth when we can produce it at home. The boycott of foreign cloth, therefore, must go hand in hand with the production and sale of Indian cloth in India.

The task of this production will be too heavy for mills for a considerable period of time. Mills cannot grow up like mushrooms; they require an enormous outlay of capital. If, therefore, we are to efficiently clothe our whole population, we must turn to foreign cloth or hand-spinning. The supply of mill-cloth will not be equal to the demand; the prices of mill-cloth, therefore, are bound to rise, if we concentrate on Swadeshi but do not turn to hand-spinning. Secondly, we will have to import all this machinery from outside: and this means a very heavy drain on our resources. Thirdly, even if the mills solve the problem of production, the problem of equitable distribution will remain unsolved. The multiplication of mills means concentration of money in a few hands and thus favours the exploitation of the many by the few. Fourthly, India will have to go through all the evils attendant on large-scale machine production owned and financed by capitalists, such as periodic crises, the diversion of masses of men from villages to cities, unhealthy city life for them, and so on.

India, therefore, can solve to some extent her economic problem by a judicious use of the Charkha and hand-spun cloth. The agriculturist suffers for months together from enforced idleness. He must be able to turn to a supplementary industry which would give him the necessary addition to his meagre income. Spinning is the 'easiest, the cheapest, and the best' supplementary indus-

try. "The revival of hand-spinning and hand-weaving will make the largest contribution to the economic and moral regeneration of India."[1] The whole case for Khadi is put by Gandhi briefly. "I have no quarrel with the mills... India requires nearly 13 yards of cloth per head per year. She produces, I believe, less than half the amount. India grows all the cotton she needs. She exports several millions of bales of cotton to Japan and Lancashire and receives much of it back in manufactured calico, although she is capable of producing all the cloth and all the yarn necessary for supplying her wants by hand-weaving and hand-spinning. India needs to supplement her main occupation-agriculture-with some other employment. Hand-spinning is the only such employment for millions. It was the national employment a century ago. If this employment were revived, it would prevent sixty million rupees from being annually drained from the country and distribute the amount among lacs (hundreds of thousands) of poor women in their own cottages. I, therefore, consider Swadeshi as an automatic, though partial, solution of the problem of India's grinding poverty."[2]

The great superiority of the Charkha over the alternative method of cloth-manufacture does not lie in the field of production but in the field of distribution. The fundamental economic problem in the West to-day is the problem not of efficient production but of equitable distribution. It is our inability to meet this problem that we have to-day everywhere poverty in the midst of plenty. Gandhi wants to fight this concentration of capital in the hands of a few as much as any communist: but his methods are different. The proposition of Khadi is his reply to the heavy industry, or big business. This does imply a certain desire in him to go back to the medieval organisation: but not a desire to wipe out the work of modern science, and machinery. There is no proposal

to impose a capital levy: no proposal to expropriate the expropriators. There is not even a desire to diffuse broadly the blessings of material prosperity: but there is certainly a will to improve the conditions of the masses, and to protect them against the evils of grinding poverty and starvation, without having recourse to extreme measures against capitalists. "No amount of human ingenuity can manage to distribute water over the whole land, as a shower of rain can. No irrigation department, no rules of precedence, no inspection, and no water cess. Everything is done with an ease and a gentleness that by their perfection evade notice. The spinning-wheel, too, has got the same power of distributing work and wealth in millions of houses in the simplest way imaginable."[1] An addition of three annas a day to the income of a poor man in a village means a substantial gain, even in these days of high prices.

Hand-spinning and hand-weaving were never meant to drive out machine-spinning and machine-weaving. They were to be supplementary to each other. Gandhi may not be fond of either capitalists or capitalism. But he is not their implacable enemy. His whole aim is to transform the very atmosphere in which the evil tendencies of capitalism thrive. Nor is he an implacable enemy of machine or mass production. But he combats them so as far they are inimical to the higher values of life. A return to the ancient or medieval India of his imagination may be our ideal: but the case for a decentralisation of industry does not necessarily imply it. There is a place for the Charkha, even to-day, in our age of machines. The "needle has not given place to the sewing machine; nor has the hand lost its cunning in spite of the typewriter. There is not the slightest reason why the spinning-wheel may not co-exist with the spinning mill even as the domestic kitchen co-exists with the hotels."[2]

The gospel of the spinning-wheel has a wider meaning for Gandhi. It is not merely an economic gospel for increasing the material wealth of the country and spreading it more uniformly among the poor. It is to be the secret of economic independence, national regeneration, and eventually of political Swaraj. "The spinning-wheel is a force of national regeneration. If we wish for real Swaraj, we must achieve economic independence. Boycott of foreign cloth is its negative aspect. For this we must produce cloth sufficient to clothe the country. With such conditions, there could be no drain, no exploitation, and, therefore, no *Para-raj* (other's rule). A little village could make terms with the rulers of the land consistent with its self-respect, dignity, and independence."[1]

The spinning-wheel means for Gandhi, above all, a moral weapon. Its main use is that it may enable us to steer clear of some of the worst evils of modern industrialism. Gandhi demands that every one should be fed and clothed largely through his own exertions: but beyond this, he is indifferent to purely economic values. Maximum production, maximum acquisition may be the goal of an acquisitive society: but to Gandhi only the moral values matter. The spinning-wheel is a poor agent of production: and in the race for material wealth, India with the use of the wheel cannot expect to come to the front. But Gandhi does not recommend mass production by means of machines, because it means the reproduction of the evils which the West tries to get over, but is so far unable to do. " Think of the huge moral wastefulness involved, of strikes and similar evils under which the industrial world is reeling. One shudders to think of perpetuating the inhuman slums that form an universal feature of modern industrial towns."[2] " It involves the honour of Indian womanhood. Everyone who has any connection with the mill industry knows that the women working in

the mills are exposed to temptations and risks to which they ought not to be exposed."[1] Khaddar, therefore, "has a soul about it." In the Khaddar is the secret of solution of India's many problems because it really means the deliberate determination of a great people to subordinate economic values to higher values, to work unanimously for the redemption of the poor and the helpless, and to make India as far as possible economically self-sufficient and morally united, and politically strong but harmless. "I cannot imagine anything nobler or more national than that, for, we should all do the labour that the poor must do and thus identify ourselves with them and through them with all mankind."[2]

25 CONCLUSION.

Gandhi has been the greatest moulding force in Indian life and Indian politics from 1917 onwards. His greatest contribution to the Indian struggle is his personality. Personality is an elusive and baffling and yet the most striking fact in all dynamic politics. It is so difficult to define its nature or analyse all its constituents or the exact source of its influence. Gandhi's simplicity, sincerity, iron determination, clear intelligence, shrewdness, unselfish devotion to his country, invincible faith in God and ultimate values, and sweet reasonableness have all been assets to the Indian cause. To many friends as well as critics, he has often appeared a puzzle. His mind sometimes appears like an open book, and he who runs may read it. But at other times he appears subtle, complex, and even somewhat slippery. He becomes a mystery not only to others but even to himself. He retires into himself, gropes for new light, and springs a surprise upon all. Consistency of an outward, superficial type is not always there: but a deeper consistency is visible to an acute observer. His fidelity to

certain ideals is unquestioned, but his expression of these ideals necessarily varies in different circumstances. There is an element of mysticism in his nature: and his invocation of his inner voice, his search for new light have provided ample food sometimes of cheap ridicule and sometimes of deep reflection to his people. Gandhi has become a cult, a creed, a charmed word to hush into silence many controversies, a magic name which has proved more powerful than anything he has said. Gandhi is greater than his creed in this sense that he has put life into some time-honoured dogmas by the sheer force of conviction and made them once more alive.

Gandhi's most important contribution to the political thought of India and of the world is his attempt to spiritualise politics. Such an attempt cannot be very successful. Politics becomes sometimes less efficacious and finer moral ideals suffer degradation by such an attempt. The saint has to practise the art of worldly accommodation and compromise, and the politician appears again and again to lose his grip over the struggle here and now. The result is often doubly disastrous. The saint often appears to vanish in the politician and the politician sometimes vanishes in the saint. Considerations of eternity too often conflict with considerations of time: and the politician-saint wobbles between the two and seems to cover his retreat by an apparent, if not real, change of front. There are serious limitations to this attempt. But the attempt is a great one. The logical intellect would refuse to accept a permanent dualism, an eternal chasm between theory and practice, brtween moral ideals and earthly realities. The compartmental theory of human life that we must give to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's and to God the things which are God's, works well only to a certain limited extent. The distinction between right and wrong has to be properly understood and

properly applied. But once we accept the precise distinction between right and wrong, we have got to apply it to all situations, without reservations. What is wrong for the individual cannot be right for the nation : and the distinction maintains its validity everywhere and at all times. A certain absoluteness about the distinction has to be maintained, if the distinction is to be considered valid at all. Circumstances alter cases; and no act, no mode of conduct should be separated from its surrounding conditions. Gandhi accepts this doctrine of relativity freely; but it does not mean that there is a point beyond which the whole distinction ceases to be valid. Men in their private capacities are different from men in their public capacities: but this does not mean again that really different moral standards operate in two cases or that moral standards operate only in the individual relations between men and men and do not at all apply to the corporate life of nations. There ought not to be a radical conflict between what is expedient under the circumstances for the politician and what is right under the circumstances for the individual. The difference is bound to be apparent, not real.

The principles of morality are the principles which are valid at all times, for all people. They are deductions from our common human nature and our human circumstances. They are the conditions of the realisation of the best that is in us as individuals and nations and are not the subjective arbitrary products of human cunning or human fancy. They imply that human beings are not mere creatures of use and want, of instinct and adaptation, but are essentially creatures of large discourse, who 'look before and after and pine for what is not.' The yearnings after the Infinite are the most important fact about us and not our desire for nutrition and reproduction; and these yearnings determine the conditions of our higher life.

Gandhi starts with belief in God and the eternal moral order and tries to base his whole individual life and the life of his nation on such a belief. If there were an eternal moral order, it is upto us as human beings to fulfil the requirements of such an order, in order that we may realise our highest potentialities, both as individuals and nations. The requirements of such an order must be essentially the same for all people. God is one; Truth is one; and the search for that Truth, the progressive realisation of God can be the only destiny worthy of men everywhere. Gandhi turns to politics with a view to realise for himself and for his countrymen this fundamental truth about ourselves. How then can he afford to be a mute spectator of the ghastly tragedy he sees everywhere ?

The tragedy is not the poverty of India, nor the dominance of certain vested interests–feudal and bourgeois. That tragedy is our forgetfulness of the fundamental truth of our being, our forgetfulness of our real selves. Gandhi is out to reinstate God in our midst. This is the central motive of all his thinking–the ultimate end of all his efforts. Religion is, therefore, the essential basis of his politics, of his economics, of his sociology, of his morals. Religion means the essential religion, the universal religion, the eternal religion: the religion which consists in Love of God and man. This is the central truth of Hinduism, of Christianity, of Islam, of every great faith. Gandhi wants us to build our life on this rock of ages, so that we may build splendidly and build enduringly.

The peculiarity of Gandhi is that his religion takes on a dynamic form and insists on its realisation here and now. His religion is not that of an ascetic who refuses to have anything to do with the world. His religion is that of a saint who is determined upon permeating the whole world with his saintliness. Religion is, therefore, brought from heaven to earth, from the cloister to the

market-place. The Infinite is to be seen and realised through the Phenomenon. Man's effort for emancipation is not to be a flight from the world to the Deity. It is to be an attempt to bring the Deity to the world. Gandhi's idealism intends to capture the world and make it the mouthpiece of God; the whole social, political, and economic order is to be the embodiment of our highest ideals.

Gandhi merely reverts to the highest teaching of the Gita in this attempt to spiritualise the world. He is here one with the recent tradition both of the East and the West. The Eternal, the Infinite is the most powerful source of inspiration known to man: it is only by invoking it that we make human movements irresistible. Man has to be lifted up from the narrow grooves of his egoistic life and be identified with the central source of life in the Universe. Man never rises so high, never dares so much as when he thinks himself the chosen instrument of God for a great purpose. In India, no cry has such an effect upon the masses as the cry of God. The country, the nation, the race, the class do not play such a part in our life as the idea of God. Unselfishness is not a new thing in India; renunciation is a very old and popular ideal: sacrifice and suffering are bred in the bones of the Eastern people. But unselfishness took on a negative form and meant absence of selfishness; renunciation meant the renunciation of the world, the flesh and the devil for a transcendental deity; and sacrifice and suffering are often mutely borne in the name of fate or the will of Allah. Gandhi's greatest service is the organic linking up of the ancient philosophic and the religious teaching of the Hindus with the modern economic and political ideals. The desire to get Moksha, to be one—eternally one—with God appeals to the Eastern soul more than anything else. It was reserved for Gandhi to seek his God not apart from society, but in and through

society, not apart from the State, but in and through the State. If once the two ideals of individual emancipation and social perfection be united in the mind of the nation, the great problem of energising the vast, teeming hordes of India and making them move to new goals, by new methods gets solved. The old traditions of sacrifice and suffering, of renunciation and unselfishness get a new content and become positive forces of a new life for the Indian people. Ancient Hindu culture thus becomes alive in a new context aud the whole soul of India now seeks expression through the novel method of social revolution.

Such is the meaning of Gandhi's attempt to spiritualise politics. The Tilakite school had made a beginning in this direction: but Gandhi goes much further than it. The cult of Ganapati or Shivaji worship is not broad enough for the whole nation made of Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Parsis. The cult of one God is different. Politics in India becomes much broader acd richer by being made the expression on the part of a whole people seeking their God and their highest spiritual fulfilment through revolutionary methods. It, therefore, can enlist the interest of the masses and classes alike, of the Hindus and Muslims, and above all, of all right-minded Christians all over the world. Here is a basis prepared not only for the new national order in India, and in the East, but also for a wider international order all over the world. Here is a platform in which the anti-imperialists, the anti-foreigners, the anti-capitalists, and the anti-communists can unite in a common effort. Here is an ideology which perfectly fits in with the highest ancient Hindu culture and the highest Christian culture.

Some of Gandhi's traits find their explanation in this point of view. His studied attempt to renounce worldly pleasures and possessions, to preach and practise the ideal of self-control in general and celibacy in parti-

cular, his vegetarianism and his experiments with natural (uncooked) diet, his changes of dress progessively from a Westernised pattern to a half-nude type of a fakir (ascetic) with a loin cloth, his frequent resorts to long fasts as a method of individual purification as well as social salvation, his public prayers very early in the morning, his observance of Monday as a day of silence, are all actuated by his new ideal. He has to become like a little child to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. He has to practise the humblest roles, the role of a scavenger or of a weaver or of a farmer in order to destroy the last traces of egoism in him. All this is not pose; it is not charlatanry. His frequent confessions of failure both about his public campaigns as well as about his inner life are honest testimony to the struggle of his soul and consciousness of his weakness.

The spectacle of a fakir, of an earnest seeker after truth in politics may appear novel or amusing to some: but it is perfectly in harmony with the highest Indian tradition. The ideal of renunciation practised for a great cause inspires reverence everywhere, but nowhere more than in India.

To understand Gandhi is to keep in mind this fundamental point of view. This ideal is the one key to his whole social philosophy and his whole life. That is the one secrect of his greatness, of his enormous influence. The ideal of God-realisation is not a new one; the ideal of eternal search after truth is also not original; but the unshakable determination of Gandhi to translate that ideal first in his own life and then in the life of his whole community appears a bit startling and revolutionary. The real Gandhi is not so much an intellect as a will bent upon realising his faith in concrete deeds in the organisation of his country. It is this force of personality behind his creed and the will to realise it in the whole social order in India that

give him so much momentum.

How is God to be realised in the life of humanity, in the life of India? The first and most essential condition is the respect for personality, both in individuals and in nations. Gandhi is a theist and not a pantheist: he believes in the reality, in the indestructible significance of every soul, of every group. The realisation of the One in the life of the Many is his fundamental philosophic ideal. There is latent divinity in every one of God's creations: and the whole effort of the social order should be towards the liberation of this divinity. Hence Gandhi's demand for the freedom of the Indian Nation. The Indian nation owes it to itself and the world that it should be free to be itself, to do its best both towards itself and towards the world. A nation is supposed to have a soul of its own and this soul seeks full development in the world. But no nation is an ultimate end in itself: it is a part of the life of humanity. Humanity cannot express itself fully except through the individuals and nations composing it. But it is humanity that is seeking self-expression through the Indian Nation. A nation which does not respect the paramount rights of humanity, and the equal rights of other nations will be a positive menace to itself and to the world. The national ideal is not the ultimate ideal: it is subordinate to the international ideal. The Indian nation is seeking freedom in order that it may be able to make its unique contribution to the culture of the world.

Gandhi is a nationalist to the core; he opposes nationalism to imperialism, internationalism of the false type, to communalism within, to racialism, to provincialism, and above all, to the economic proletarianism of the communistic type. His position is very similar to that of Mazzini. The Indian is an abstraction, a futile and ineffective person apart from the Indian nation: and the Indian nation is equally an abstraction apart from

humanity and God. Exclusive territorial patriotism, when it assumes agressive form often becomes a menace to the world; but it is because it is taken apart from the life of humanity. Political and economic independence may also become a fetish and may spell ruin for the world. The fascist emphasis on one's own nation, one's own country, right or wrong, leads inevitably to the war of peoples. The ideal of economic autarchy ultimately leads to the same conclusion. This tendency can be avoided only if one recognises the ultimate ends of human life. Gandhi is a Liberal when he asks us to remember the precise limitations of the national ideal. Dominion status has no terrors for him, provided he gets substance of independence. The imperialism of the wrong type is as mischievous as the fascist ideal: the two are essentially indistinguishable. Exploitation of nations by nations should go. The world ought to be made safe for genuine nationalisms of all the peoples.

The economic order again is a part, and a subordinate part, of the social order and not the whole of it. The profit motive should be deprived of its sting; it should give way to a higher motive. The lie behind both capitalism and communism is the same: the subordination of the higher life of humanity to the economic motives. Fascism is right when it tries to control the whole life of the nation and bring it under the influence of the national idea. The nation alone is supreme: all sections and classes must bow down to it. The nation is one and indivisible: it must rise superior to all internal particularisms. The totalitarianism of a nation is the logical consequence of the national ideal. But it must not come in conflict with the fundamental object of its existence, viz. that it is to be the vehicle of the higher life of humanity. Fascism is wrong therefore in pushing the claims of the nation too far, by forgetting its essential idea.

Here Liberalism is a necessary corrective to Nationalism. Gandhi's nationalism is different from the Liberal nationalism of India, inasmuch as it harks back to ancient Hindu culture and it is far more emotional and comprehensive : but it is equally different from the fascist nationalism of to-day. Gandhi is a Liberal : he believes in the rationality of man and his limitless capacity of progress. His faith in human nature, though derived from a deeper source, makes him as democratic as the Liberals. His nationalism is not meant to swallow up all minorities. It only means that the nation as a whole should prevail over every other interest: but the nation as a whole does not demand the suppression of all internal differences. The nation's autonomy is consistent with the autonomy, within certain limits, of every individual and every community within it. This is democracy. It is the right and duty of every individual and every group to be oneself. Here there is equality, the equality not of material possessions, but of opportunity.

Gandhi's great idea is that all genuine differences should be subordinated to and reconciled with the idea of humanity as a whole, the idea of God. A real unification is desirable because it is the *sine qua non* of existence, strength, effectiveness. National unity is not an end in itself; it is a means to an end. The end is the expression of God in ways unique to each;. it is the enrichment of the life of humanity. But national cohesion is a necessary condition for the most effective assertion of all individuals, groups, interests. The Hindus are not the enemies of the nation; the Muslims are not the enemies of the nation; the Englishmen are not our enemies, the landlords, the capitalists, the princes are not our enemies. It is a one-sided analysis of the Indian situation which prescribes the elimination of any of these classes as the only way of establishing Indian unity, Indian in-

dependence, and Indian Swaraj. But while Gandhi does not want their extinction, he does desire their assimilation to the national ideal. The greatest weakness of India is her particularism: and the whole trend of progress in India should be in the direction of weakening these centrifugal forces, which make for disruption.

The individual is the centre of Gandhi's philosophy: and the individual as an incarnation of the divine idea, is an end in himself. The State is an organisation for the development of the individual; it is a means; it is not an end in itself. Society is equally an institution for the attainment of individual perfection. The nation also is not a transcendental entity; it is equally bound to recognise the individual's right to complete fulfilment. The individual and his God form a complete society by themselves according to one time-honoured tradition of the Hindus. But Gandhi goes a step further and interpolates caste, religion, country, nation, State, and humanity between the individual and his God. But they are all conditions for the fulfilment of the highest possibilities of man's nature: and nothing more.

The need of organisation in every sphere of life for the most effective development of human beings is openly accepted by Gandhi; but the method of organisation should be democratic, not autocratic. Here is one of the greatest insights of Gandhi, which radically differentiates his philosophy from the outlook of the dictatorships both of the Right and the Left. Gandhi will like to carry the ideas of discipline and organisation almost as far as the fascists or the communists. He believes with the fascists in the great principle of leadership and the hierarchical organisation of society. He does not for a moment forget that no mathematical equality in society is desirable, for society is not made of equal, homogeneous, undifferentiated units like the particles of dust in a dust-heap. The whole

essence of society, whether made of nations or of individuals, is that it is made up of units, diverse in talents, capacities, aptitudes, temperaments, situations, each one of which makes the social whole richer because of its uniqueness. Nations as well as individuals are, therefore, indestructible units in the organisation of the world. Each one of them should have autonomy, both in name and in fact, autonomy political, cultural, economic, in the interests of the whole of humanity. But this autonomy implies not a loose, unregulated, chaotic play of social atoms, for then it will destroy the social structure completely. It implies that the higher self in nations as well as individuals should have the right and the duty to control the lower self. There is no high and low in God's creation, but there must be the unquestioned supremacy of the Right and the Good in every social organisation. The only liberty to which each unit is entitled is the liberty to be good, the liberty to realise the best in oneself, the liberty to play one's exact part in the whole effectively, the liberty to enrich the cultural life of humanity. But such a liberty implies that there is a law laid upon each one of us by the social whole. It implies an organisation, which prescribes to each unit its proper rôle in society, to which that unit is fitted by nature and by training.

The main aim of Gandhi is neither political nor economic : it is in the highest sense of the term religious. It is to bring about a change of heart: a change of heart in the higher castes towards untouchables, a change of heart in Hindus towards Muslims, and in Muslims towards Hindus, a change of heart in the capitalists and landlords and princes towards the masses, and a change of heart in the Englishmen towards Indians. The ideal of Dharma or social justice is to be made vivid and operative first in men's minds and then in the institutions which employ men's minds. The essential *raison d' etre* of this change

of heart is that the stage may be prepared in the mind of the country and of humanity for the realisation of God, for the worship of great ideals which are the sum and substance of the higher life of humanity and of the universe. Gandhi is an idealist, in the metaphysical sense. He believes, first and foremost, in the validity of the speculative ideal. He is God-intoxicated and wants the whole universe to be God-intoxicated. He is fighting to enthrone God in the universe, and in the hearts of men. The ideal of perfection which he worships is not static, it is not the realisation of perfection which is there for all time. The ideal is essentially dynamic and essentially social. It is the progressive realisation by human efforts, individual and collective, of God who is implicitly present in all of us. What is this God ? He is essentially universal love, transcendental love, love which casts out fear, greed, anger, selfishness in all shapes and forms, love which passeth understanding. He is the God of Europeans as well as coloured people, Hindus as well as Muslims, the haves as well as the have-nots. He is the one Soul which is seated in the hearts of all. To realise God is to realise oneness of our soul, oneness of our deeper spiritual life, in the midst of all diversities and conflicts. Such is the goal, 'the far-off divine event' to which the whole creation moves. Democracy, socialism, nationalism, internationalism must be all harnessed to the service of this ideal. They should all be different ways in which God fulfils Himself, in which the common man is slowly coming back to his own in this world.

It is only when we remember this background that we can understand the whole Gandhian way. The central truth of life, the fundamental message of Hindu sages, the ideal of great religions like Christianity is here seeking re-utterance, through a frail-looking man, to a country 'made weak by time and fate' but strong to seek,

to strive, to find once more her ancient but eternal self and not to yield till it is found. It is this truth which enables us to make use of the great systems of thought and life like democracy, nationalism, and socialism without being a prey to their one-sidedness, their limitations. Each of these systems seizes a part of the truth well, but when it sets itself up as a whole, the tyranny begins. The whole of life must be governed by the whole of truth. The tyranny consists not in government, but government of a whole by a part, the government of self by elements alien to the self, because not properly mastered by the self. Democracy is not wrong, but a democracy which confines itself to one section of the people whether to higher classes as in Greece, or to higher castes as in India, or to white people as in the British Empire, is likely to be a fraud. Democracy is not a failure; but a democracy which remains a capitalist or political democracy and refuses to broaden into an economic democracy seems to break down. The name of democracy, the forms of democracy are becoming everything; the spirit is forgotten. The real meaning of this great ideal is that it should create such social, political, and economic conditions, suited to each nation, as would lead to the maximum release of the creative, spiritual self of humanity, the divine potentialities of every man, woman, and child. Gandhi stands for such a democracy. Its fundamental idea is the respect for the soul of man as man, for the personality of man and woman as such.

Economic equality is a part of the democratic ideal: but we would not make a fetish of it. It is true that whoever neglects the material basis of civilisation, neglects it at his peril. Every honest man therefore must be assured by the State of a fair day's work and a fair day's wage. A decent minimum of subsistence and leisure is a perfectly

legitimate demand on the part of every human being. This implies two things: the increasing control of society, of the State over the instruments of production and some control over the methods of distribution and the articles of consumption, on the one hand, and the elimination of parasitism in all its forms. The production for profit may have to give way to the production for common use. The exploitation of man by man, class by class, nation by nation, woman by man must go. But this does not mean that life should be a struggle for economic goods and economic power only. Mere piling up of material wealth will never satisfy the real hunger of man. Mere economic equality will not carry us very far. Gandhi's main aim is to emancipate man from the thraldom of the mere economic motive, to transform the acquisitive society into a functional society.

The conditions of life do not constitute life itself. The satisfaction of material appetites is a condition of life; it is not life itself. Society is there not only to enable us to live, but also to live well. The multiplication of wants, or the multiplication of means for the satisfaction of these wants is not the essence of our civilisation. Machinery, large-ecale production, capitalistic methods or communistic methods of intensified production are welcome so far as they mean the emancipation of humanity from mere drudgery of earlier eras or starvation and destitution of the common man. But Gandhi is not very enthusiastic over increased production. He intends to inform this whole machinery of modern civilisation with a nobler, more humane spirit. There is a giant's strength behind it: but it must not be used like a giant. The great, eternal human values must not be sacrificed at the altar of the machine. Man does not live on bread alone. Man lives on 'admiration, love, and hope.' Let man grow in knowledge; but there should be more reverence for the higher values in the soul of man.

It is the same with the ideal of nationalism. Here also there is a confusion of means and ends. Nationalism is an instrument, a powerful instrument in the hands of man. But it must be a servant of the humanitarian spirit, it must continue to be a training-ground for the soul of man. The greatest tragedy of our time is that the two most powerful machines modern civilisation has evolved viz. the economic machine and the political machine, the system of machine-production on a mass-scale and the system of national organisation of human life for national purposes, have almost become the masters of man. The great task of our generation is not to destroy these agencies, not to go back to the primitive simplicity of medieval life, but to direct them to the achievement of the greatest ideal of all time, the freedom and perfection of the individual man. India also must try to develop her inner unity, her autonomy, her freedom from external and internal hindrances, in order that she may be once more effective in the noblest sense of the term.

Gandhi, therefore, does not preach contentment with things as they are. Society should be based on the idea of justice, and the ideal of social justice need not be a static one. It is our sacred duty to demand that social arrangements should be such as to give the fullest possible scope to every talent, to every legitimate interest. Life is essentially a fight against injustice, against inertia. It should be always an active, ceaseless search for social perfection. But how is the fight to be carried on? The dictatorial method is to use coercion, if necessary; the liberal method is to settle all differences by argument; the Gandhian method is to secure agreement as far as possible by the practice of Satyagraha. Here is a new technique -new to a certain extent both in the history of India and of the world.

The method of non-violent resistance to wrong is

Gandhi's special contribution to political thought and practice. The non-violence of Gandhi is an antithesis to violence, to the method of rebellion, war, and individual assassinations. These methods have been sometimes effective in the past; but what is the cost? Gandhi radically differs from the communist in his method of bringing about a 'permanent revolution.' It is not the cost in human blood which matters so much. There is a limit to our power of achieving bloodless victories. Gandhi agrees with all violent revolutionaries, and with the advocates of war, to the extent that preparation for suffering and death on a large scale, on the part of some persons, is absolutely essential, if a great change in human relations is to be effected. But there is a world of difference between to be prepared to die and to be prepared to kill. If war evokes some of the highest virtues in man, a non-violent war is equally good in making a call upon the idealism of our nature. The price of liberty everywhere and at all times is eternal vigilence and eternal capacity for suffering and martyrdom. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. Non-violent war requires as much heroism, as much devotion to the fatherland and the cause of justice, as much power of organisation and collective action, as a violent war. It is, therefore, a spiritual equivalent of war. It is as much an antidote to growing selfishness, commercialism, sloth, and luxurious living, as a national war is. But there is one fundamental difference. There is invocation of no hatred in a non-violent war. A non-violent soldier must be full of love towards those whom he is fighting. It is to vindicate his love for the opponent, his deeper brotherhood that he prepares to go through the fire of suffering.

The Krishna in Gita wants Arjuna to kill without hatred. Gandhi invokes the same mental attitude of perfect disinterestedness, perfect devotion to one's cause, of

perfect freedom from egoistic attachment to consequences. But he does not want us to kill. Why? To the Gitakar's idea of Asang he adds the Christian or Buddhist ideal of Ahimsa. Violence should not be resorted to, because it begets more violence, and the vicious circle will never end. Hatred begets hatred and love begets love. This is the elementary principle of the new psychology of Ahimsa. Fight the wrong, the crying social wrong at all costs, even to the bitter end of complete self-immolation: but fight only out of the abundance of love in your heart for your opponent. There is here no piling of armaments, no terrible waste of resources implied in modern warfare. There is here no vast, cataclysmic destruction of human life at the altar of imperialistic or national grab or hatred. There is here no foundation laid in one war for future wars. And yet there is to be a ceaseless urge for a better order and a preparation to undergo any amount of suffering for the cause. The objective is a more permanent one, not a mere change of outer conditions, but a deeper change of heart.

No revolution can be lasting which does not enlist on its side human nature. Compulsion goes skin-deep: it cannot transform the inner man from within. Unless the inner springs are touched, unless the whole man is moved from the depth of his consciousness, the ground is not prepared for a great and lasting change. The Kingdom of Heaven is to be therefore first established in human hearts and human wills. An appeal to reasoning leaves people cold, when their interests are concerned. An appeal to force is a two-edged weapon and brings in its train terrible reactions. Its victories are ephemeral. A great social revolution should not be organised over the heads of the people concerned. The new social order can function effectively, with the minimum of friction, only if it is based on the sincere wishes and affections of men.

Here the new technique, if it is properly practised, holds in itself a promise of initiating a new era in the history of the world.

The creed of Gandhi is superb: but are we equal to it ? Humanity has struggled hard for centuries: how many Christs and Buddhas it has produced ? The objectives of social and individual struggle must change. There cannot be genuine Satyagraha of the highest order for material gains. The whole motivation of man must change. The army of Satyagrahis, who are to be the vanguard of the New Order, based on love and mutual service, must not hanker after any earthly goals of pleasure, or power, or fame. They should be prepared to completely sacrifice all the narrow egoisms–individual, communal, provincial, racial, national,– at the altar of the cause of Truth. The passion for pure Truth must come upon them like a frenzy, and they should not shrink from the highest sacrifices for its sake. The whole soul, the deepest soul, the eternal soul in us should be roused for the achievement of equally great results. The sacrifice must be proportionate to the cause: and the cause must be one of unmixed purity and truth, so as to inspire and justify such a sacrifice. There is no denying the fact that the possibilities of the human soul are endless: and we have so far not tapped any considerable part of these possibilities.

It is true that India, both by her strength and weakness, is qualified, to a greater extent than perhaps any other country just now, to move in the direction of a non-violent assertion of her cause. Gandhi's cry of non-violence is great: it moves the deepest springs of the deepest souls in this country. India's great task is to re-deliver her ancient, sublime message of the oneness of human soul, of the utter identification of our human soul with the deepest principle of the universe, and of the

undisputed paramountcy of the spiritual ideal in life. How can she do this better than by the practice of this sublime creed and thus bring about a conversion of the sceptical and selfish humanity to her point of view? Gandhi here represents the logical development of Hinduism and Neo-Hinduism in the present social and political context. The problem of India is to find out her Self, the central idea of her culture, and to reconcile the warring creeds, communities within, and India to the Empire and rest of the world, in the light of this ideal. India can no longer live in mystic isolation. She cannot achieve her goal now in the path of Nivritti, of renunciation. For good or evil, the Hindus and Muslims have to stay together; for good or evil, the destinies of India are linked with the rest of the world. The path of violence is not really open to her. The surrounding world is armed to the teeth. The communities within her are also at loggerheads. Hence the necessity of caution, of circumspection, of infinite patience. She cannot afford to make a mad rush for independence. She should not invite self-destruction by a policy which is likely to react more upon herself than upon the foreign conqueror. Under the circumstances Gandhi's non-violence seems to be the only alternative.

But the non-violence which India can practise to-day is not the non-violence of Gandhi's imagination. It is no doubt active, ceaseless fight for justice and liberty in every sphere of life. It is no doubt an opposite of the creed of physical force. It is further vastly more than the negation of physical force: it is intensive constructive work in every department of life. A great nation can be hammered into existence only by perpetual work on right lines not merely of the negative type (e. g. abstention from drinks and use of foreign cloth) but also of a positive type, building small industries moving slowly

towards the ideal of national self-sufficiency, creating more avenues of service and employment for the nationals, modernising agriculture, re-organising education, and so on. If people are prepared to live for the nation year in and year out, as they are sometimes prepared to die for it, the nation will go slowly but surely forward. Non-violence further implies the progressive assimilation of the Hindus as well as the Muslims to the national ideal. Non-violence may not be metaphysical: but it should be practical in every sense of the term. The victories which will be thus won may not be dramatic, but they shall be lasting.

Such is Gandhism in theory. It is difficult to form an estimate of the exact repercussions on the nation's life, character, and destiny of the personality of Gandhi and his ceaseless propaganda. We are too near his time to be able to take a very detached view of the situation. The effects of the Gandhi movement are also slow to work themselves out in the world of practice. There is a reaction on just now: and the hostility to Gandhi as well as Gandhism is increasing. The practical influence of Gandhi's creed has, according to some, exhausted itself, and, according to some others, has provoked more storms than it has quieted. To all outward appearance Gandhism has just now passed from its stormy period to the period of comparative quiescence. It has become less a dramatic revolution and more a conservative movement which makes for the consolidation of the ground it has covered. Gandhi is not always organising mass civil resistance, and his mass civil resistance does not always succeed in its immediate objectives. There are periods when the country seems to be galvanised by his whirlwind propaganda which seems to carry all before it, and there are periods when he seems to be 'retiring', taking stock of situations, gathering the harvest of his revolutionary cam-

paigns and turning solely to constructive work. To-day, his opponents say that Gandhism is resting on its oars, and has become mere constitutional, parliamentary reformism.

But the essence of Gandhism holds the field, although its forms of expression vary. Gandhism is essentially the spirit of Truth and Love and Service ceaselessly at work in the life of humanity, on a small or large scale. Constructive work is its very soul. Endless patience coupled with the utmost concentration on details seems to be its very nature. True non-violence is every day affair: it does not feed upon passions, or spectacular performances. It is born of the coolest, deepest, and most persistent attachment to the cause of truth and justice. It is very remote from political fireworks and mass demonstrations. A non-violent atmosphere has to slowly grow all around us. There should be an invincible belief in God, in the higher possibilities of human nature, in the oneness of human soul, in the wonderful capacity of purest sacrifice and suffering to transform the whole social and political scene, in the unfailing efficacy of daily concrete deeds in our daily lives to tell surely upon the nation's life. The whole man must be moved from the depths of his being, and seek expression not intermittently but constantly, not in quixotic sacrifices and martyrdom during wars and revolutions, but in his daily life.

The fundamental ideas of Gandhism will slowly but surely come to their own. They are essentially sound; they are in perfect harmony with past Indian culture and present Indian requirements. Gandhism is the spiritual link which may unite India's past with India's future, India of the Hindus with the India of the Muslims, India of the aristocrats and bourgeoisie with the India of the untouchables, peasants and workers, India of the independence-walla with the India of the Imperial ideal, India of the

Ancient East with the India of the future reconstructed world. The temporary, the dogmatic, the superficial forms of Gandhism may disappear 'unwept and unsung'; but the abiding truth of Gandhism is a rock on which New India can be securely built. The revolt of Gandhi against the West really means that India must build on Indian foundations, that she should make her new civilisation a vehicle in a new context, of her ancient, eternal culture, that she should be cautious in adopting the mere forms of Western culture, and try to avoid the pitfalls of the capitalist civilisation of to-day. It does not necessarily mean a complete return to some imaginary, golden past of the noble savage of Rousseau. It means complete reconstruction-social, political, economic-of India on her ancient foundations. The forms of our new culture may be as modern as we choose; but the spirit informing it must be the spirit of our venerable past.

There is, however, a wide gulf between the enunciation of this great ideal and its realisation in a New Order. There have been failures and set-backs in so many directions and one wonders where really Gandhi has brought us. The Independence of the country still remains a dream; and the economic exploitation in so many forms from within and without goes on. The spirit of non-violence has not achieved any of its major objectives. The Hindus and the Muslims remain as disunited as ever. The untouchables are not enthusiastic about the national idea. The princes and the landlords and the capitalists sit very tight on their privileges and positions. The Englishman has not undergone a change of heart because of non-violence. Particularism is coming back upon us like flood in its various forms: communalism, provincialism, classism. The national idea is certainly not in the foreground of the picture to-day. The spirit of violence, mutual hatred, group selfishness is once more gaining ground. The totalitarian

States seem to be ready to pounce upon India, at any moment, when the Empire weakens. The only bright spot in the horizon is Provincial Autonomy and the growth of a certain co-operation between the official class and the Congress Party for wider purposes of national welfare.

Yet Gandhism remains a force to be reckoned with. We shall sum up its contributions in the eloquent words of one of the ablest and most sympathetic students of contemporary India: "Here is a unique personality in history. With the weapon of non-violence which he found embedded in the life and blood of the people, he worked for a great national revival. In creating this power (which would enable India to achieve Swaraj), this new consciousness resting ultimately on a faith in the Providential direction of human affairs, his achievement has been a marvellous success. He is fully conscious of the fact that his countrymen have lost all confidence in themselves, that the morals of the nation have been undermined, that Indian Society has become stagnant and that institutional religion has produced a mental paralysis. He believes that no nation can be free unless it is purified and reformed from within. He is not in haste. He desires to lay the solid foundations of a New India as a nation, as an organ of regenerated mankind, animated by the principles of mutual service and love. With that end he is working for the creation of a new environment—social, economic, mental, and religious—in which a new social order may be brought into existence and may function on a basis of justice and equity, enabling each human soul to realise the fullness of life. He has arrested the process of destruction of our ancient heritage and culture. He looks with alarm upon the processes of Western civilisation, with the pursuit of material goods, with its mechanism for the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few which increases unemployment and poverty, and even when it makes leisure possible for the few, makes these few unfit for the profitable enjoyment of their

leisure. He wants to rescue the rising generation from the de-Hinduising and de-nationalising processes which are making them forgetful of their great past. He has been working for the growth of a new nation in India, creating and quickening the desire for freedom in the masses. He has aroused them from their apathy and slumber. He has taught them no longer to fear their Rulers. He has generated a ferment in the soil of India which will in the course of time evolve into a collective life of vigour and beauty. There has been under his influence what one may call a sudden manifestation of the upward urge of life in the group phase. He has delivered hammer-strokes against the strongholds of the conservative elements of Hindu society which now shows signs of crumbling. By his intense crusade against untouchability, he has shaken the foundations of Hindu orthodoxy and liberated the Hindu mind from the yoke of authority and blind submission to the past. By his advocacy of Khaddar and the revival of village industries in general he has aroused the hopes of a poverty-stricken population for a happy and healthy life. He has brought about a revolutionary change in the life of the women of India, emancipating them from the bondage of ages, dragging them out of their confinement into the free life of service, the equal companions of men in the struggle for freedom. No single individual in the world has during his lifetime achieved such wonderful results. He is not to be judged by what he has actually achieved but by the possibilities of achievement which he has opened out to his country. The seeds that he has sown will fructify in the years to come, bearing increasing witness to the greatness of his personality.

"It may be that a portion of his teaching may not be of permanent value to India and to humanity, and will not be embodied in the new life that is evolving in India. His economics is primitive—the dream of a medieval saint

who thinks of achieving greatness for his country by stepping out of the industrialising current of the world, returning to the simple conditions of the old days with the spinning wheel, at a time when mass production is the order of the day. His philosophy of life is too ascetic and has been determined by the nature of the work to which he found himself called. It is couched in terms of freedom from the necessity of birth which invokes sin and suffering. His politics is affected by his mysticism. His belief in soul force and his weapon of non-violence may be misplaced and irrelevant in a universe that only respects guns. From an immediate point of view he may have failed in achieving India's freedom. His attitude towards the Princes and the landlords and the propertied classes is only a reflection of the optimism that mysticism inspires. He could not have succeeded, given the environment which he worked. It is true that there has been a reaction against his teaching. But let not the presence of this reaction cloud our judgment about the permanent value of Gandhiji's lifework. He has quickened the millions of India into a new life, his asceticism has been tempered by a sense of the material woes of his generation. Satyagraha has in his hands become a potent instrument of social and political reform achieving in a few years a transformation of the entire outlook of a people which normally would have been spread over decades. And when in later times the accidents and irrelevancies of the present float out of the vision, permitting us to see unclouded the results of his work, Gandhiji will be regarded not only as the saint and seer but also as the great statesman of his age, who laid the foundations of the new India of the future, converting a listless and apathetic humanity into a unified nation, proud of its past, prepared for danger and responsibility, aroused into a sense of shame for the social wrongs embodied in child-marriage and caste organisation and untouchability, chastened by their

sufferings to be the bearers of a new nationalist dream which will teach mankind to abhor war and aggrandisement and to live in peace and friendliness as members of God's family. But Gandhiji's teaching has even a wider significance. Worshipped as he is in our own country as a seer and saint, his fame legitimately reaches out to the world at large, as the bearer of a new, and yet an old, message to humanity. At a time when the war clouds are gathering both in the West and the East, and the nations of the world armed to the teeth are preparing for one more occasion of satisfying their primitive instinct of combat, the world has seen the performance of a great novel experiment; thousands of men and women under the leadership of Gandhiji offering themselves, a voluntary sacrifice, at the altar of law and order, so that a new order may be established on the basis of a change of heart on the part of those who represent the old. If love can win in the affairs of daily life, it can also win in the larger affairs of the world. It needs no witness to its ultimate victory. Gandhiji through his life and teachings bears witness to the supremacy of love, calling the nations of the world to a life of simplicity, warning against the corruptions of a sinning world, challenging the might of an empire by the powers derived from a clean and spotless life rooted in the love of God."[1]

Gandhism seems like a dream just now, splendid to look at, but a little unrelated to the sordid realities of to-day. There is boldness, there is splendour in his imagination; and what is more, there are elements of promise in Gandhi's sublime creed, for the creation of a better world in time to come. But truth and love as foundations of a better life for humanity all round, though never so much needed as to-day, still remain visions of an idealist, and nothing more. Even then the attempt is great; and better perhaps the failure of such an attempt than

success of a humdrum type based on ugly compromises with existing interests. Justice has been the cry of men and nations all through history: but the great problem is to define justice in a way perfectly satisfactory from the point of view of various interests concerned and then to secure its realisation. History on the whole has accepted the argument of force: and the talk of those who will meet force with force does not carry us beyond force. Mere reasoning also does not tend to solve some of our knotty problems: for reasoning is very often a creature and a tool of the interests and prejudices of parties concerned. Humanity has yet to evolve a set of basic principles on which its life may rest securely, principles which are acceptable to all, principles which may regulate the relationships between nations and classes, and a body of men who can be relied upon to be absolutely impartial in their application. It is so difficult at present for the greatest of us to look beyond one's own group, or nation, or class. Under the circumstances, the argument of force remains supreme. Gandhi knows too well that mere reasoning has its limitations: he, therefore, invokes force in the form of purest sacrifice and intensest suffering on the part of perfectly selfless men intensely wedded to truth and full of love for humanity, for the sake of an absolutely just cause. Moral force is to be the substitute for material force. Non-violence is the effort to substitute moral force for material force. It is the search for the deeper common bond between us; it is the effort to synthesise our view-points at a higher non-materialistic level. For such a movement to be successful what is needed is a complete transvaluation of values. But some day humanity will ask more earnestly than to-day the same question: is there no alternative to war and bloody revolution for a struggling humanity? Will grab-individual or national—remain the highest motive for humanity and brutal force its one instrument? It is there

that Gandhi steps in with his answer: but he remains to-day either a liberal constructive politician trying to take as much as possible for his countrymen, by the use of existing machinery or a pale and ineffectual angel beating in the void, his luminous wings in vain.

REFERENCES.

Pages.			
7	1	The Political Philosophy of Mr. Gandhi. 1922, Madras.	Introduction by M. Ruthnaswami.
8	1.	Mahatma Gandhi: His Own Story. C. F. Andrews.	54.
10	1.	Satyagraha in South Africa. M. K. Gandhi, 1928	114–116
11	1.	,, ,,	142–144.
12	1.	,, ,,	145.
14	1.	,, ,,	164–169.
15	1.	,, ,,	464.
18	1.	Mahatma Gandhi. R. M. Gray and Manilal C. Parekh.	37.
	2.	,, ,,	38.
19	1	Preface to Satyagraha in South Africa.	
	2.	,, ,,	
	3.	,, ,,	
20	1.	,, ,,	
21	1.	Mahatma Gandhi. Gray and Parekh.	49–50.
	2.	,, ,,	50.
	3.	,, ,,	51.
22	1.	,,	55.
	2.	The History of the Congress. B. Sitaramayya.	281.
24.	1.	Sir P. Sivaswmy Iyer. Quoted in Mahatma Gandhi. Gray and Parekh.	119–120.
	2.	The History of the Congress. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya.	305.
	1.	,, ,,	333–4.
	2.	,, ,,	334.
26	1.	Young India, 9th June 1920.	
	2.	Mahatma Gandhi. Gray and Parekh.	61.
27	1.	Young India. 1919–1922. S. Ganesan. 3rd Edition.	XXXIII.
28	1.	,, 4th August 1920.	
29	1.	A Nation in the Making. S. Banerjea.	307
30	1.	Athalye. Life of Lokamanya Tilak.	290–301.
38	1.	The History of the Congress.	615–6
40.	1.	Young India. 6th October 1921.	

Pages.

41	1.	Young India. 20th October 1927.	
	2.	„ 24th April 1924.	
43	1.	„ 22nd September 1927.	
44	1.	„ „	
	2.	„ 6th October 1921.	
	3.	„ 13th „ 1927.	
	4.	„ 6th „ „	
45	1.	„ 1st September 1927.	
46	1.	„ 27th August 1925.	
	2.	„ 21st „ 1924.	
48	1.	„ 11th October 1928.	
50	1.	„ 8th April 1926.	
52	1.	Andrews. Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas.	172-3.
53	1.	Young India. 29th September 1927.	
54	1.	„ „	
	2.	„ 7th October 1926.	
56	1.	„ 6th October 1921	
	2.	„ 21st July 1921.	
57	1.	„ 3rd February 1927.	
	2.	„ 26th August 1926	
58	1.	„ 1st Sept. 1927.	
60	1.	„ 29th April 1926.	
61	1.	„ 16th September 1926.	
	2.	„ 5th June 1924.	
	3.	„ 15th September 1921.	
62	1.	„ 15th September 1921.	
	2.	„ 12th March 1925.	
63	1.	„ 2nd April 1925.	
64	1.	„ 13th October 1920.	
	2.	„ 24th November 1927.	
65	1.	„ 20th September 1928.	
66	1.	„ 24th November 1927.	
67	1.	„ 17th March 1927.	
	2.	„ 17th December 1925.	
68	1.	„ 2nd June 1927.	
69	1.	Indian Home Rule. 6th Edition.	
70	1.	Young India. 13th November 1924.	
	2.	Young India. Volume III. Ganesan.	997-8
71	1.	„ 13th November 1924.	
72	1.	„ 23rd February 1922.	
73	1.	„ 12th May 1920.	

Pages.				
	2.	Young India,	6th January 1927.	
74	1.	,,	3rd April 1924.	
75	1.	,,	23 February 1922.	
76	1.	Indian Home Rule.		45–50
77	1.	Young India,	21st January 1919.	
	2.	,,	13th October 1921.	
78	1.	,,	11th August 1927.	
79	1.	,,	18th July 1925.	
82	1.	,,	28th April 1927.	
	2.	,,	25th October 1928.	
83	1.	,,	15th November 1928.	
	2.	,,	,,	
84	1.	,,	10th May 1928.	
85	1.	,,	1st December 1927.	
87	1.	,,	16th March 1921.	
88	1.	,,	21st April 1927.	
90	1.	,,	10th March 1927.	
91	1.	,,	1st December 1927.	
93	1.	,,	1st November 1928.	
94	1.	,,	15th September 1927.	
	2.	,,	17th November 1921.	
95	1.	,,	27th August 1925.	
	2.	,,	6th August 1925.	
96	1.	,,	8th December 1920.	
	2.	,,	12th January 1922.	
98	1.	,,	5th January 1922.	
	2.	,,	12th January 1928.	
99	1.	,,	5th July 1928.	
100	1.	,,	22nd June 1921.	
	2.	,,	26th June 1924.	
101	1.	,,	12th January 1928.	
102	1.	,,	20th September 1928.	
103	1.	,,	11th September 1924.	
104	1.	,,	10th March 1927.	
105	1.	,,	6th September 1928.	
106	1.	,,	12th January 1928.	
	2.	,,	22nd June 1921.	
107	1.	,,	13th December 1928	
	2.	,,	21st August 1924.	
	3.	,,	29th January 1925.	
108	1.	,,	17th July 1924.	

Pages.			
109.	1.	Young India, 6th April 1921.	
	2.	,, 22nd September 1920.	
	3.	Young India, 12th August 1926.	
110.	1.	,, 22nd September 1920.	
112.	1.	,, 25th May 1921.	
	2.	India's Case for Swaraj.	44.
113.	1.	,,	59.
	2.	,,	59.
114.	1.	Harijan quoted in Free Press, September 18, 1938.	
115.	1.	Young India, October 1, 1931.	
	2.	,,	
116.	1.	,, February 14th, 1920.	
	2.	,, January 14, 1920.	
118.	1.	,, September 13, 1928.	
	2.	,, August 11, 1920.	
121.	1.	,, ,,	
	2.	,, September 13, 1928.	
122.	1.	,, ,,	
123.	1.	,, ,,	
	2.	,, ,,	
124.	1.	Speeches and Writings of Mahatma Gandhi, Third Edition, Natesan.	227.
125.	1.	Young India, 11th August 1920.	
	2.	,, 24th March 1920.	
126.	1.	,, March 9, 1922.	
127.	1.	,, December 21, 1931.	
130	1.	,, October 8, 1925.	
	2.	,, June 16th, 1920.	
131.	1.	,, October 8, 1925.	
133.	1.	,, October 4, 1928.	
	2.	,, February 27, 1930.	
134.	1	,, 23rd June, 1919.	
135.	1.	Indian Opinion, Golden Number.	
136	1.	Young India, April 6th, 1921.	
138.	1.	,, June 9th, 1920.	
	2.	,, March 10th, 1920.	
139.	1.	,, 22nd September 1920.	
	2.	,, 27th October 1920.	
140.	1.	,, January 5, 1922.	
141.	1.	Speeches and Writings of Gandhi.	530–2.
	2.	Young India, 23 February 1921.	

Pages.				
142.	1.	Young India,	April 6, 1921.	
		,,	August 11, 1920.	
	2.	,,	August 11, 1920.	
143.	1.	,,	June 16, 1920.	
145.	1.	,,	May 29, 1926.	
	2.	,,	May 6, 1926.	
146.	1.	,,	June 16, 1920.	
	2.	,,	23rd Fabruary 1921.	
147.	1.	Speeches etc.		538.
	2.	,,		539.
	3.	Young India,	9th March 1920.	
148.	1.	,,	May 9th, 1924.	
149.	1.	,,	28th July 1920.	
	2.	Speeches etc.		549.
	3.	Young India,	August 25, 1920.	
150.	1	,,	24th November 1921.	
	2.	,,	12th January 1921.	
153.	1.	,,	July 28, 1921.	
	2.	,,	,, 13, 1921.	
	3.	,,	Speeches etc.	393.
154.	1.	Harijan,	October 12, 1935.	
	2.	Young India,	10th March 1920.	
155.	1.	,,	10th March 1920.	
	2.	,,	22nd September 1920.	
156.	1.	,,	29th September 1920.	
157.	1.	,,	6th October 1920.	
158.	1.	,,	,,	
159.	1.	,,	January 14, 1920.	
160.	1.	,,	February 9, 1922.	
	2.	,,	,,	
161.	1.	,,	August 11, 1920.	
	2.	,,	December 26, 1924.	
	3.	,,	31st March 1920.	
162.	1.	,,	January 5, 1922.	
	2.	,,	August 11, 1922.	
163.	1.	Speeches etc. of Gandhi. Natesan.		230-1.
164.	1.	Young India,	January 23, 1930.	
	2.	,,	9th April 1925.	
165.	1.	,,	21st May 1925.	
	2.	,,	30th April 1925.	
	3.	,,	,,	

Pages.				
167.	1.	Young India,	21st May 1925.	
	2.	,,	,,	
168.	1.	,,	March 12th, 1930.	
169.	1.	,,	January 23, 1930.	
171.	1.	,,	1st September 1921.	
	2.	,,	28th July 1921.	
173.	1.	Speeches etc.		537–8.
174.	1.	Young India,	February 16th, 1921.	
178.	1.	,,	18th May 1921.	
	2.	,,	29th May 1924.	
179.	1.	,,	,,	
180.	1.	Young India,	29th May 1924.	
	2.	,,	26th December 1924.	
181.	1.		19th February 1925.	
	2.	,,	6th October 1920.	
182.	1.	,,	20th October 1921.	
183.	1.	,,	18th September 1924.	
184.	1.	,,	19th January 1921.	
185.	1.	,,	27th April 1921.	
186.	1.	,,	27th October 1920.	
	2.	,,	27th April 1921.	
187.	1.	,,	1st September 1921.	
188.	1.	,,	,,	
189.	1.	,,	5th July 1928.	
190.	1.	,,	12th March 1925.	
191.	1.	,,	,,	
192.	1.	,,	1st September 1921.	
	2.	,,	17th December 1920.	
193.	1.	,,	29th March 1928.	
	2.	Speeches.		369.
197.	1.	Young India,	2nd February 1921.	
198.	1.	,,	13th April 1921.	
	2.	,,	5th July 1928.	
199.	1.	,,	13th October 1921.	
200.	1.	Speeches.		286.
201.	1.	,,		291.
202.	1.	Indian Home Rule.		105–109.
	2.	Young India,	17th June 1926.	
203.	1.	,,	5th November 1925.	
	2.	Indian Home Rule. Ch. XIX.		
204.	1.	Young India,	10th May 1928.	

Pages.				
205.	1.	Young India,	8th August 1925.	
	2.	Speeches.	379.	
206.	1.	Young India, July 1921.		
207.	1.	,,	15th May 1924.	
	2.	,,	26th January 1928.	
208.	1.	,,	25th August 1920.	
209.	1.	,,	,,	
210.	1.	Congress Presidential Addresses. Natesan. Vol. II.		736.
	2.	Young India, 21st June 1919.		
	3.	,,	,,	
211.	1.	,,	,,	
	2.	,,	25th August 1920.	
212.	1.	,,	21st June 1921.	
213.	1.	,,	17th April 1927.	
215.	1.	,,	21st July 1920.	
	2.	,,	18th August 1920.	
216.	1.	,,	6th July 1921.	
	2.	,,	21st July 1920.	
217	1.	,,	6th July 1921.	
	2.	,,	16th February 1921.	
218.	1.	,,	21st April 1920.	
	2.	,,	20th October 1921.	
244.	1.	Mahatma Gandhi. P. A. Wadia.		69-73.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. GANDHI'S WORKS.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth.
Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Navajivan (Gujerati), Navjivan Press, Ahmedabad.
Satyagraha in South Africa.
Young India. 1919-1922. S. Ganesan.
1924-1926. ,,
1927-1928. ,,

Harijan.
Indian Home Rule.
India's case for Swaraj,
Speeches in England. (1931).
Speeches and Writings of M. K. Gandhi. Natesan, Madras.

II. LITERATURE ABOUT GANDHI.

C. F. Andrews : Mahatma Gandhi : His Own Story.
George Allen and Unwin.
C. F. Andrews : Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas.
George Allen and Unwin.
H. S. L. Polak : Mahatma Gandhi. Natesan.
Rev. J. G. Doke: An Indian Patriot in South Africa (out of print).
R. M. Gray and Parikh : Mahatma Gandhi, Association Press, Calcutta.
H. M. Muzumdar : Gandhi, the Apostle. Chicago.
H. S. L. Polak : Golden Number of Indian Opinion, Natal, South Africa.
G. B Gregg. Economics of Khaddar. S. Ganesan, Triplicane, Madras.
,, The Ethics of Non violence.
Mahadeo Desai: Gandhiji in the Villages.
,, Gandhiji in Ceylon.
Krishna Das : Seven Months with M. K. Gandhi.
H. N. Brailsford : Rebel India. Victor Gollancz.
Romain Rolland: Mahatma Gandhi. The Swarthmore Press.

Select Bibliography.

René Fülop Miller: Gandhi, the Holy Man. Putnam's Sons, London.

" Lenin and Gandhi.

B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya: The History of the Congress. Congress Working Committee.

P. A. Wadia: Mahatma Gandhi. New Book Company, Bombay.

Prof. Kalelkar: The Gospel of Swadeshi. S. Ganesan.

Pearson W. W.: The Dawn of a New Age. S. Ganesan.

John S. Hoyland: The Case for India. Dent and Sons, London.

Kirpalani J. B.: The Gandhian Way. Vora and Co., Bombay.

Athalye: Life of Mahatma Gandhi.

Babu Bhagwan Das: Philosophy of Non-Co-operation.

Rutnaswami: Political Philosophy of Gandhi. (out of print).

Sardul Singh Caveeshwar: Non violent Non-Co-operation (1934).